

The PRINCIPLES  
of the  
PROTESTANT  
RELIGION  
MAINTAINED,

And Churches of New-England, in the  
PROFESSION and EXERCISE thereof  
DEFENDED,

Against all the Calumnies of one George Keith,  
a Quaker, in a Book lately Published at  
Pensilvania, to undermine them both.

---

By the Ministers of the Gospel in Boston.

*Composed by Dr Cotton Mather.*

Prov. 18. 17. He that is first in his own cause  
seemeth just; but his neighbour comes and  
searches him.

Phil. 2. 3. Beware of dogs, beware of evil wor-  
kers, beware of the Concision.

2. Thes. 2. 10, 11. They received not the love  
of the Truth, that they might be saved;  
And for this cause God shall send them strong  
delusion, that they should believe a lye.

---

BOSTON, in New-England,  
Printed by Richard Pierce, and sold by  
Booksellers. MDCXX.

PROTESTANT  
RELIGION



56...173,4



**A** Letho the Church of God, which is a  
of men professing the Truth, & pursuing  
the Ways of the Lord Jesus Christ, as  
Sacred Scriptures have Recommended them  
the world, has in all ages undergone the Assault  
of a various assault, yet it has out-liv'd them all.  
At one while there arise Persecutors with Cruel  
Clab in their Hands, endeavouring by Force to  
banish out of the world, that Godliness, which  
their sore eyes feel an Ey-sore in, so that  
while, the grand Enemy of our Salvation brings  
Hereticks upon the stage, who with Fraud  
perswade the people of the Saints of the Church  
high to unchurch themselves by parting with  
the means of Communion between them and  
God. But by hereto an Abortion has been  
and their attempts against that Mount Sion which  
cannot be removed, but remaineth for ever.  
The impotent Assaultants find themselves but pull-  
ing hard against the great stone, and perish by  
its Rolling over them. This is among the Glori-  
ous things which are spoken of thee, O Church  
City of God!

Indeed the Craft of the old Serpent hath no  
more is self in any one thing more malicious &  
dangerous, than in his Fitting of Seducers to the  
several Designs, Peoples, Tempers, which he  
has had to manage. He knoweth, that at the first  
creation, for the new Creation, vigils must be kept

## The Præface

He has used a thousand Blinds to keep a saving  
Light from entring into the souls of men, that  
being a people of a wrong understanding, He  
that made them might not have mercy on  
them. Hence the Deceivers of the former days  
having been baffled & conquer'd by the Spirit of  
the Lord lifting up a standard against them,  
in the Labours of His faithfull Servants; the  
Hydra of Error, has had new sprouts proceeding  
from it; among which, that of Quakerism seems  
to be one of the vilest, as well as one of the La-  
rest, and we see therein fulfill'd, what was long  
since fore-told, That Seducers will wax worse  
and worse. In Quakerism we see the Vomit  
cast forth in the by-past ages by whole kennels of  
those creatures, for whom the Apostle to the Phi-  
lippians has found a name, licked up again for a  
new Digestion, and once more expos'd for the poi-  
soning of mankind; and it is especially the more  
ignorant & unwary, & envious part of man-  
kind which it is adapted unto: few swallow it  
but the more silly & feeble sort of souls, & those  
in whom the Light (which they so much adore) has  
affords little better Directions, than those of an  
Ignis fatuus. Indeed Quakerism is the peculi-  
ar plague of this Age. One that was a pillar  
of it, wrote in the year 1659. such a passage  
that, It is now about seven years since the  
Lord raised us up, And as the Novity of the

## The Præface.

ing self proves their Fallity, so tis beyond all mea-  
sure admirable, that in so clear a day-light of  
He the Gospel, so many should espouse it. It is thro'  
on the wrath of the Lord of hosts, that any part  
ays of the English Nation should be so darkned, as  
of to follow this new light; and it is the particu-  
em, lar disgrace of the English, with but one or two  
the Nations more, to have these people in it, who tho'  
ing they tremble, yet beleieve not, but oppose and  
ems muddy the whole of that Religion, by which we  
La-draw near to God.

ong We cannot but have our sad Apprehensions, when  
rise we behold this great Chpak-weed of the Christian  
mit Protestant Religion, taking root in the Borders  
of N. England; and, whereas unto our own In-  
phi-inations to be doing so, their have been added  
or a be Provocations of one George Keith, in a late  
poi-Book addressed both to them for their Establish-  
ment, & to us for our Conviction, we have count-  
an-d ourselves concerned to appear in the defence of  
those glorious Truths, which all Quakerism ( &  
those George Keith's particularly ) does oppugn. We  
ve have answered the Cavils and Sophisms of the  
an champion whom the American Quakers do so  
culi-much admire, not feeling in any of his arguments  
lar-be weight of a Weaver's beam; and if in a-  
e any passages we have done it cuttingly, we knew  
that some are so to be rebuked. But the Reader  
f the must oblige himself to peruse the Whole of our  
set Treatise.

## The Preface.

Treatise, before he pronounce upon the sufficiency and validity of our Answer; we found it so dull a thing to follow the confused methods of our Antagonist, and to renew our Discourses as often as his tedious and nauseous Repetitions came in our way, that we resolved, as we met the several Harshes we would Answer once for all; and therefore we do pass over with a dry Foot many unsound Assertions in diverse parts of his Book, because by the very same in other parts of it, we were forc'd to wade over shoes in the mire after him. And we take no notice at all of the calumnies, which in the close of his little Volume, he loads the Reverend Increase Mather with, because the Son of that worthy person, has elsewhere already vindicated him. We wish that we could do with any hopes propound the Conversion & Reduction of George Keith, as the end of our present undertaking. But we fear lest his Apostacy after he had been enlightened & had tasted of the good word of God, hath render'd him incurable. If it should be so, we must expect, that tho' the Arrows here fetch'd from the Scriptures of the Lord Jesus, may force from him a, Thou hast overcome! yet we shall have no Return from him, except those of rage & wrath, which we shall not count it worth the while to publish any reply unto, but what the Archangel gave to a falling Accusation.

## The Præface.

We do likewise wish, that we had more hopes  
And turning others that have been profelyted ( tho'  
in a scarce any have been so by him among ourselves )  
ow into his Perswasion, from the Error of their  
Ha-way ; which we do sincerely declare to be the  
and worst that we wish to them, tho' it be also the  
narest that we can do for them. They are much  
e, be mistaken, if they think that we shall ever pursue  
them with any thing but Pitty, and Prayer, and  
after reason, which they want above most in the world.  
um We desire no Revenge on them, for all the Rail-  
ing and Hatred, which they so commonly follow.  
be withal, save only to pluck them as brands  
out of the fire. But, alas, tis usually a penal-  
ould judicial, vindictive Stroke of the great God up-  
Re the minds of men for sins against the Gospel.  
pre our Lord Jesus, accompanied not seldom with  
acy very sensible Possession of Satan, thro' which  
asted Delusions of This way come to be received.  
n in and the Efficacy thereof, is therefore frequently  
that obstinate for a Cure ! Only, the Power and  
ture mercy of God, can Restore those wandering  
thouls ; which we do from the very bottom of our  
turnsarts implore.

which However, we have just Hopes, that we shall  
ish a furnish the Churches in this Land, with an  
e to antidote against the Contagion of Quakerism ;  
I supply our Conflicting Neighbours with An-

## The Preface.

Y<sup>e</sup> swers to encounter the Attempts made by Seducers upon The faith once delivered unto us. There hath been a sort of Quakerism not long since broached in Italy, the Professors whereof go under the Name of Quietists, and the late Pope himself was not without suspicion of being infected with it. But the Quakers among us are some of them so far from being Quietists, that they disturb the Quiet of all that are about 'em, and go about, seeking whom they may deceive. 'Tis our Duty to Warn you against them, Ye Flocks of our LORD! and we do it in the Name of our Glorious Master, whom you declare to be Your King, your Lord, your Law-giver.

We cannot be faithful, if we do not warn you against (at least) the Teaching, Talking, Busie and more Bigotted Quakers, which infest you, as a Sort of men, who invite you to give up at once, your whole Religion, and to Embarque your souls no more on that Bottom, which all the Saints have hitherto been saved upon. If you shall think it convenient for you, to part with your Pastors because the Wolves bark at them, We do assure you, that most of us could have lived much more easily and pleasantly, and provided more comfortably for our Families, if we had applied ourselves to other Callings than

## The Præface.

...ers than that of the Ministry; It is our Grief  
and Care for You that will make us cry after  
since, Intreat us not to leave you, for our  
and must be your God.

Pope But how can you think of parting with an  
infinite and Eternal GOD, and having a  
created Soul blasphemously placed in His  
throne? How can you think of parting  
with a precious Bible, as a Dead Letter,  
and having Silent Postures of your own, in  
Your Room thereof? How can you think of part-  
ing with an Inestimable REDEEMER,  
deprived of a dim Light within you, which may prove  
our Darkness it self; and then, How great is that  
Darkness! How can you endure to see the  
whole Gospel, which your souls have hitherto  
built upon, all evaporated into Dispensations  
and Allegories, and meer mystical Notions? Bap-  
tism and the Supper of the Lord Jesus, of  
no Advantage to your Faith, your Love, your  
Joy? Can you with any patience behold the  
glorious Doctrines of Election, and Justifi-  
cation, and Perseverance, depraved with O-  
pinions that make Man to be All, and Grace  
have small or no share in the matters of  
salvation?

lies! But, Blessed be our GOD, our Churches  
have yet had very little Impression from any Se-  
ducers



## The Præface

ducers hitherto ; and they are the more obscure  
nooks and skirts of the Countrey which These  
do make any figure in. We nevertheless for-  
bear not these wholesome Cautions ; and tho'  
we believe, the Day is at hand when our  
Blessed Saviour will Purify His Temple, and  
sweep Quakerism among other Defilements out  
of it, with a swifter and a greater Force  
than we can promise to our present Endeavours,  
yet we are now making some little Essayes at  
that work, by taking the brushes of the Sancti-  
fary, to strike down what Cobwebs, the Qua-  
kers have been spinning there.

James Allen.

Joshuah Moodey.

Samuel Willard.

Cotton Mather.



THE



(1)

*The Introduction.*

**I**T is reported of *Bellarmino*, that great *Atlas* of the *Papal* Interest, that after his Death, there was a sharp Contest in the *Lateran*, whether his books should not be called in & burnt, as having in them as much exposed the cause by his over liberal Concessions, as supported it by his cunning Sophisms. And we are told that the Papists have hanged *Erasmus* between Heaven and Hell, because he profest himself a *Catholick*, and yet wrote too much like a *Protestant*. The Hands were *Esaus*, but the Voice *Jacob's*. And what Reason *G. K.* hath to expect the like treat at the hands of his brethren the *Quakers*, will be obvious to any that shall read his late pernicious *Pamphlet* pretended to be emitted for the Discovery of the false Doctrines of some particular sorts of Professors of Religion, but indeed to Bid Defiance to the True Religion, in the principal fundamental Articles of it, as they have been in all Ages and places acknow-

B ledged

Jedged by the Church of Christ, which he hath clothed in a rough Garment to deceive withal. For however he expresseth a right spirit of a Quaker, in his nonsense, fallacious way of declaring himself, and bitter Reviling of the Orthodox, which is enough to proclaim him one of that Society; yet might any Credit be given to his words, and the commonly-received Sense put upon his Expressions, it is apparent that he hath mightily betrayed the Cause he undertook to patronize, and (setting aside his *Bling-gare* Rhetorick, a gift seldom separable from these men) hath said more against their received Principles (if they ever had any) than against ours. For if he speak the Judgement of the Quakers, it is certain that G. F. and other Rabbi's of that Sect were mistaken, for they speak quite another thing; except he will tell us, we poor Ignorants understand not the Language of their spirit, which regards neither Grammar nor Logic; and this is the *Hercules's Club*, where with they are wont to knock all our Reasons in the head, and brayn them at once.

However, his Design is easily discerned. The Devil himself, that spirit of Dejection, knowing that some principles are rivetted

## *The Title and Epistle considered*

In men's Minds, will nourish them (tho' he be the *Father of Lies*) that he may graft his *Falsehoods* upon the stock of them: and why should not his *Messengers* do the like in Imitation? See 2. Cor. 11. 13, 14, 15. He hopes by some large Concessions to gain Credit with the Simple, and perswade them to say as they, *Act. 23. 9.* for whose sake only have we undertaken him, and not for any need of Refuting his Errors, which have been so often Cashiered, there being no *New-Revelation* in them, but what has been the Vomit of ancient *Hereticks* licked up by him, and again disgorged.

### *Reflections on his Title-Page and Epistle.*

In his Title he talks high and looks big, and would hold the world in hand that he had at once routed, broken & disbanded all the Orthodox Churches in Christendome, and proved that they had neither *Doctrine, Ministry, Worship, Constitution, Government, Sacraments, nor Sabbaths*, but what are Surreptitious, and not belonging to the true Church of Christ: and truly if men would be dared out of their Religion, he hath bid as fair for it as any we know, but how farr they fall

4 *The Title and Epistle considered.*

before his [in-words] acknowledged Test, is yet to be Tried: And be it known to all men, That we are not yet sensible of the wounds that he hath given, any further than as the Name of *G O D* is blasphemously abused by him, and drawn in to patronize his filthy dreams. When we read his *Inscription*, *Benhadad* seems to be risen agen; who sent that confident Threatning, *1. King. 20. 10.* and the Answer of the King of Israel is enough. *ver. 11.*

He had so much *Pride* and *Gall* to crowd into the Title, that he is fain to borrow a Room in the left-hand page, to put in a few Scripture Citations, maliciously abused and misapplied, which, whether they belong to our Churches and Ministry let the Day declare: we are not to stand or fall at the menacing Prædictions of an *Enthusiast*.

He directs his Epistle to us, giving his word for it (so far as it will go) that the book was written in good will to us; and if to slander and calumniate with bitterest Invectives, may pass for a Demonstration; he hath proved his Love to be *Extraordinary*: and truly it is as much as we expect from one of his humour.

There

## *The Title and Epistle Considered.*

There is little observable here, but what will be met with in the Treatise, and once to Answer such paltry stuffe is enough, if not to much: It may therefore be passed over with two or three Remarks.

He calls us to *turn our minds to the Light of Christ within us*, for our better information; we have done it as well as we can, & it tells us, That his Assertions are bold, presumptuous, and Hæretical.

He tells us, It is the *same spirit that gives to all Readers a right understanding of Scripture*; but if so, why then have not all the same understanding of it, but Contradictory? Can it be the Spirit of God, who is alwaies the same?

He bids us to *Believe in Christ, and joyn our minds to His divine Illumination, and He will anoint the eyes of our Understandings, & we shall have our eyes open to see &c. q. d.* If we will see of ourselves, then He will give us Ability to see: this may be no Contradiction in a Quakers Logick.

We have him also in a fit of *Charity*; (and we are beholden to him, for we shall not alwaies find him in so good a mood) granting that *some of us may be in some sense of the true Church*; which how it should

*The Title and Epistle considered.*  
be when we have neither Doctrine, Ministry, Worship, &c. of a true Church among us, let him see to that: But we have him afterwards, putting on his Spectacles, and then he retracts his Charity with a witness.

We have him also nibbling at the Doctrine of *Perseverance*, which we shall shortly find him beating down with Axes and Mauls, and there shall take him to task. Only It is worth the while to observe, what a notable (and no doubt inspired) Doctrine he recommended to us, viz. *That the Quickning in a man, as it abides, it is impossible it should perish*: To pass the Non-sense of it (which must be allowed a Quaker, or you undoe him) let us note its profoundness, If Grace continue, it cannot be lost, a thing cannot be and not be at the same time; could Delphos have delivered a more mysterious Oracle?

Finally he tells us plainly that his Design is to turn away our Hearers from us, under the Title of *False-Teachers*; i. e. he aims at no less than the subverting of all the Churches of Christ in *New-England*, yea, in all the World: A Gygantick Essay! But let him do his utmost, as long as Christ sits upon His Throne we are not dismayed



diminued. As for the Imputation of being false Teachers, we can ( thro' Grace ) appeal to many of our Hearers; in Paul's words, 2d Cor. 3. *beginn.*

*Reflections on Chap. 1. of the Holy Scriptures.*

We have here a Confession of his Faith, ( such as it is ) concerning the Scriptures; wherein, ( if he gives us his mind candidly, which we have cause to suspect, ( and shall give our reason before we part ) ) we are sure he doth not express the sense of his Brethren and Predecessors, except they say one thing, and mean the contrary.

*Section, 1, 2.* As for the two first Paragraphs of this Chapter, we will take them as far as they will go; though the word *Outward* hath a Reserve in it, and intimates That God hath one Rule to direct His people by *Outwardly*, and another *Inwardly*; or as if God taught us one thing by His Word, and another by His Spirit; we shall have Occasion afterwards to discourse how perniciously this undermines the *Christian Faith*; and why he hath not made *Practizes* as well as *Doctrines* liable to this Test might well be enquired. However there will be occasion to rubb up his

memory, with his own Concessions, when we find that he has forgotten himself ( for a *quaker's* spirit is not of a perfect Reminiscence ) and mean while let him try how he can reconcile himself to his Friends, who have directly ( as might be instanced abundantly ) rejected the Scriptures with Scorn. *Smith* tells us, *It is the greatest Error in the world, and the ground of all Errors, to say the Scriptures are a Rule to Christians; and many Expressions of the same import. But he will salve all with the nice Distinction of an outward and an inward Rule.*

*Sect. 3.* This Paragraph might have past, had it not been for his perverse Interpretation of it, in which he spends his Second Chapter, where we shall have it out, if our patience can but wait a little.

*Sect. 4.* We were afraid, when we saw him so liberal of his Concessions, that he would soon repent of it; we have him therefore here trying to get something of it back again; but stay, Friend, and be more frugal of your Largesses henceforward: Well, he hath given the Scripture leave ( in a good humour ) to be so far, a Rule at least, that *No Doctrine that cannot be demonstrated by it, laves us under any Obligation*.



igation to believe it: and so we are satisfied, that it is no mortal sin to with-hold our Credit from any of their New-Revelations, that are neither Scripture, nor Scripture-Consequence, which, in *Chapt. 2nd.* he pleads for.

G. K. had a mind to wheedle some into a Compliance with his Opinions who had been taught to entertain a good Respect for the Scriptures; For which reason he would insinuate, that the *honest Quakers* are not the men that they have been represented to be, nor are they such Enemies to the written Word, as they are reported; but why then doth he not correct his friend *Lucas*, who hath told us, That any *Quaker*, if he has a mind to it, (as they are arrogant enough) may make as good himself; and they challenge us to tell them what one Scripture hath Light in it; and many like *Blasphemies* not to be named.

But what shall he do to satisfy his brethren, whose Fabrick is built upon the sandy Foundation of a *New Light* and *new Revelations*, if the Scripture hath all the *Doctrines of Religion* in it? He had in his youth (when he was in the Dark, as he saith we are) gotten a little of that carnal thing called *Humane Learning*, and, tho'

one would have thought, that a dose of  
*New-Light* would have purged it all a-  
 way, yet there are some confused dreggs  
 behind, and he will try if they may not  
 help at a dead list; and let us see how he  
 will manage it, *Though* (saith he) *the*  
*Scriptures contain a full and sufficient Decla-*  
*ration of all Christian Doctrine,* yet they do  
 not contain the whole mind and will and coun-  
 sel of God, as some say they do. and, pray Sr,  
 who ever said so? *Qui bene distinguit be-*  
*ne docet.* If by the *Mind, Will, and Coun-*  
*sel of God,* he intends the *Eternal Decrees*  
 and Purposes (as these words are often ta-  
 ken) then we never said nor thought that the  
 Scriptures contain a full discovery of these:  
 they are the *Secret things which belong to*  
 God; and are so far revealed in *Scripture*  
*Traditions, & Providential Accomplishments,*  
 as God sees meet; and there are some new  
 discoveries of them every day. But if he  
 means the *Preceptive Will of God,* disco-  
 vering to man what is his Duty, in or-  
 der to his Happiness; then, not we only,  
 but he also, *Seet. 1, 2.* saith that they do  
 contain all, (if he saith any thing at all) and  
 in this sense (besides which he saith  
 nothing to purpose) here is a plain Con-  
 tradiction; for to say that a thing con-  
 tains

tain all the parts and yet not the Whole, is so in the Letter, whatever it be in his spirit.

But let us see how he proves it; and here we have a Reason for it, and then a tedious Induction of diverse Instances, and they make it as plain as can be, except you be in the Darkness.

1. The Reason is *Because* ( and if every thing that men put *Because* to, may stand for a Reason, *his* is a good one ) *there are many things wherein God doth reveal of His Counsel to His children, which are not in the Scripture, either expressly or consequentially, altogether Necessary for their peace and Comfort, i. e. Either some new Duties which were not contained (no not consequentially) in the Scriptures; or some new Promises, which the Word of God refers not to; and New Duties, & new Promises make a new Gospel, against which we are awfully cautioned; Gal. 1. 8. If there be new Duties, they must contain a new Doctrine not revealed by the Scripture; but he gives no encouragement to believe any such; Sect. 2. If new promises, they must refer to Purgatory; for the Scripture hath given all that belong to Time and Eternity, The life that now is, and that which*

one would have thought; that a dose of  
*New- Light* would have purged it all a-  
 way, yet there are some confused dreggs  
 behind, and he will try if they may not  
 help at a dead lift; and let us see how he  
 will manage it, *Though* (saith he) *the*  
*Scriptures contain a full and sufficient Decla-*  
*ration of all Christian Doctrine, yet they do*  
*not contain the whole mind and will and coun-*  
*sel of God, as some say they do.* and, pray Sr,  
 who ever said so? *Qui bene distinguit be-*  
*ne docet.* If by the *Mind, Will, and Coun-*  
*sel of God*, he intends the *Eternal Decrees*  
*and Purposes* (as these words are often ta-  
 ken) then we never said nor thought that the  
 Scriptures contain a full discovery of these:  
 they are the *Secret things which belong to*  
*God*; and are so far revealed in *Scripture*  
*Propositions, & Providential Accomplishments,*  
 as God sees meet; and there are some new  
 discoveries of them every day. But if he  
 means the *Preceptive Will of God*, disco-  
 vering to man what is his Duty, in or-  
 der to his Happiness; then, not we only,  
 but he also, *sects. 1, 2.* saith that they do  
 contain *all*, (if he saith any thing at all)  
 and in this sense (besides which he saith  
 nothing to purpose) here is a plain Con-  
 tradiction; for to say that a thing con-  
 tains

tain all the parts and yet not the Whole, is so in the Letter, whatever it be in his spirit.

But let us see how he proves it; and here we have a Reason for it, and then a tedious Induction of diverse Instances, and they make it as plain as can be, except you be in the Darkness.

1. The Reason is *Because* (and if every thing that men put *Because* to, may stand for a Reason, *be* is a good one) there are many things wherein God doth reveal of His Counsel to His children, which are not in the Scripture, either expressly or consequentially, altogether Necessary for their peace and Comfort. i. e. Either some new Duties which were not contained (no not consequentially) in the Scriptures; or some new Promises, which the Word of God refers not to; and New Duties, & new Promises make a new Gospel, against which we are awfully cautioned; Gal. ii. 8. If there be new Duties, they must contain a new Doctrine not revealed by the Scripture; but he gives no encouragement to believe any such; Sect. 2. If new promises, they must refer to Purgatory; for the Scripture hath given all that belong to Time and Eternity, The life that now is, and that which

is to come; 1. Tim. 4. 8. And if he mean only that there are *New Providences* which contribute to their peace and Comfort; as it is nothing to the purpose, so he should have done well to have imparted a little of his Light to us, to teach us how to extract this grace and comfort, without making use of the Scriptures to that end.

2. Let us see how far his Instances will help him; he gives us *Five*, though *one* to the purpose had bin worth five hundred such as these.

1. The first respects a man's *Assurance* of his present state of Grace, in his inward Calling; as he entitles it, *The knowledge whereof*, he saith, is a part of God's Counsel; i. e. it is God's will, and his duty that he be acquainted with it. That it is a duty we never denied; but that it is by the Scripture that we know it to be a duty, we believe, see 2. Cor. 13. 5. 2. Pet. 1. 10. But then, the *Assurance* it self cannot be infallibly gained by Scripture or Scripture Consequence, but only by the Spirit of God: and for this he cites Rom. 8. 16. very unhappily for himself; if he had thought of it; for by this very Citation, he gives us another point; yiz. that it is by



by the Scripture that we come to know that we must have our assistance from the Spirit alone; nay more, he grants that the Scripture gives the infallible marks of such an estate; but the Spirit must apply all this, or it cannot be known; that is the Mystery then, but what avails this? Why only this? the Work of the Spirit is neither Scripture nor Scripture-Consequence; and who knew not that as well as he? But if the Scriptures be the Instrument which the Spirit useth to work this Assurance in us by, his instance is impertinent. We assert and believe,

1. That the Spirit of God is the Author or Efficient of all Grace in the hearts of Believers; and therefore is called *The Spirit of Grace*. 2. That he useth the Word of God in Scripture, in putting Men into that state upon which their Assurance is built, *Jam. 1. 18. 1. Pet. 1. 23.* 3<sup>dly</sup>. That the Witness of the Spirit is Co-witnessing with our spirits, *Rom. 8. 16.* which is necessary to make the Evidence Authentick. 4<sup>thly</sup>. That the Testimony of our Spirits is an Evidence that is drawn from these infallible marks, which, but for the **SCRIPTURE**

we

we had not known to be such; and if the Spirit should apply any other evidence but what is according to Scripture, by G. K. own Doctrine, we are not bound to believe it.

2. The next instance refers to an *Inward Call to the Ministry*; and runs upon the same foolish notion with the former, and needs no further Answer: only let it be here laid by in store, That he pretends to owne such a distinct Office in the Church, which the Practice of the Quakers makes a Gift Common to all they account to be of the true Church, both men and women.

3. In his third Instance he begs a Principle which will never be Granted him, viz. that men are to tarry for an *Inward Call* to pray or perform any religious Duty; which being Voluntary on the Spirit's part, he concludes cannot be known simply by the Scriptures. But let it be here remarked,

1. That Moral Duty depends on the Precept, and not on inward Motions: Prayer (which he refers to in particular) is to be without ceasing, 1. *Thes. 5. 17* i. e. every day, and on all occasions. 2. That the Motion to do any thing, which is a



## Of the Holy Scriptures,

ny time upon us, is to be tryed by the  
scriptures, whether it be of God, for we  
are bidden to try the Spirits, and are direct-  
ed to the Law and Testimony as our Rule,  
and if it be not there Revealed, G. K. tells  
us we need not believe it. 3. We are com-  
manded to stir up the Grace that is in us;  
and how often have we *David* at this? yea,  
when we want the Spirit for Prayer, we  
are to pray for the Spirit.

4. As to his next instance referring to  
our Enquiring and discovering what is the  
mind of God in our Carriage under His  
Hand, and in the management of our  
weighty Affairs; when he hath said all he  
can, the Word of God, or the Scripture,  
is that which must ultimately resolve us.  
That, to know What is Duty, depends  
on Divine Revelation, we are Agreed.  
That God did sometimes reveal His Will  
extraordinarily to His Servants of Old, we  
deny not, but that the Word of God in  
Scripture is that which to us in Gospel  
Times, since the Canon was perfected,  
Answers all the other wayes of Revelation  
is an Article of our Creed, and we think  
we have Scripture-warrant for it, 2.  
*Per*, 1. 19. &c. As to the Case of *Marriage*,  
which he talks of, & instanceth in the  
carriage

carriage of *Abraham's* servant, it is quite aliene to his purpose: for who ever asserted that God's providence is bound to follow Scripture Rules, being supream & arbitrary? But still in our serving of this Providence, and knowing how to use it to His glory, and particularly to know what is the mind and will of God to us in this Providence, we have no other Rule to inform our selves by, but the Scriptures; and tho' the Spirit must reveal it, yet this is the thing Revealed.

Where as he tells us, that *Philip, Peter, and others*, were extraordinarily called to such and such services, it is readily replied, that That was extraordinary, and without warrant for us ordinarily to expect the like: moreover, the things they were called to, were such as the Scripture satisfied them to be according to God.

Finally, We deny not but that the Spirit of God doth still put an impulse on the spirits of His people frequently, but is it self-evident, or must not the Warrantableness of it be tryed by Scripture-Rules? Let *G. K.* if he can, give an instance of a Quaker that ever had such a self-evidencing extraordinary Call, as *Philip Peter, &c.* had in former dayes: How impertinently

He quotes *Jam. 4. 15.* to prove his Assertion, *if the Lord will* } may soon be seen. He interprets it of a Will not to be known by the Scripture, but by the Spirit without it; whereas any man of common sense may perceive that the sense of that Text is this; That when a man is satisfied that his design is Lawful, he is then to acknowledge that his Affairs are subject to the Ruling Providence of God, who may either *further* or *impede* his Undertaking as He will; and how comes he to be satisfied in this but by the Scriptures? If Providence furthers him, he is satisfied that it was Gods Will to suffer it; if He puts a stop to it, it discovers the secret Will of God revealing it self in this particular, & how to demean himself under this he hath all to form the Word; and what is all this to their inwardly feeling a Command or Permission, which he idly talks of?

5. Here we are told of *God's Answering the returns of the Prayers of His people*; A Quakerism! i. e. Nonsense. And we have him at length concluding his impertinent fourth Paragraph, with Assuring us, That the Scripture promises applied by the Spirit are the inward Voice of God to His children: but why hath he been all this while fighting with his own shadow, if this be all he intends?

carriage of *Abraham's* servant, it is quite aliene to his purpose: for who ever asserted that God's providence is bound to follow Scripture Rules, being supream & arbitrary? But still in our serving of this Providence, and knowing how to use it to His glory, and particularly to know what is the mind and will of God to us in this Providence, we have no other Rule to inform our selves by, but the Scriptures; and tho' the Spirit must reveal it, yet this is the thing Revealed.

Where as he tells us, that *Philip, Peter, and others, were extraordinarily called to such and such services*, it is readily replied, that That was extraordinary, and without warrant for us ordinarily to expect the like: moreover, the things they were called to, were such as the Scripture satisfied them to be according to God.

Finally, We deny not but that the Spirit of God doth still put an impulse on the spirits of His people frequently, but is it self-evident, or must not the Warrantableness of it be tryed by Scripture-Rules? Let *G. K.* if he can, give an instance of a Quaker that ever had such a self-evidencing extraordinary Call, as *Philip Peter, &c.* had in former dayes: How impertinently

He quotes *Jam. 4. 15.* to prove his Assertion, *if the Lord will* } may soon be seen. He in-  
terprets it of a Will not to be known by the  
Scripture, but by the Spirit without it;  
whereas any man of common sense may per-  
ceive that the sense of that Text is this;  
That when a man is satisfied that his design  
is Lawful, he is then to acknowledge that his  
affairs are subject to the Ruling Providence of  
God; who may either *further* or *impede* his  
Undertaking as He will; and how comes he  
to be satisfied in this but by the Scriptures?  
If Providence furthers him, he is satisfied  
that it was Gods Will to suffer it; if He  
puts a stop to it, it discovers the secret Will  
of God revealing it self in this particular, &  
how to demean himself under this he hath al-  
to from the Word; and what is all this to  
their inwardly feeling a Command or Permission,  
which he idly talks of?

5. Here we are told of *God's Answering the  
returns of the Prayers of His people*; A Qua-  
kerism! i. e. Nonsense. And we have him  
at length concluding his impertinent fourth  
Paragraph, with Assuring us, That the Scrip-  
ture promises applied by the Spirit are the inward  
Voice of God to His children: but why hath  
he been all this while fighting with his own  
shadow, if this be all he intends?

Sect. 5. Now he draws his Conclusion. *Therefore the Scripture doth not contain all the Word or Words of God*: whereas we thought that if he had concluded from the premises he should have said, *Therefore it doth*, because all these are nothing but Scripture, either expressly or consequentially. He brings in *Act. 12. 24.* *The word grew & multiplied* to prove his Assertion; but we might ask him, whether he intends its multiplying by new Inspirations or Revelations, or by multiplied Efficacy? Did not he himself resolve us, that there was no new Doctrine? and thence we infer that there was no new Word, in the sense we are disputing.

Sect. 6. What have we here? *Christ & His Apostles expounded the scriptures by Inspiration, & yet taught no new Doctrine.* Sure he forgets himself, was not the whole frame of the Gospel Dispensation a New Model? And hence there were new Institutions; see *Heb. 7. 12.* *Chapt. 8. 7, 8. & 13. 10.* for which things there was required extraordinary Inspiration; & therefore to his Demand, *Why may it not be so now?* we answer, Because the Canon is perfected; and whereas he asserts that it is so, because *some do at this day expound the scripture by the same spirit*; though it be impertinent, for if it be the Scripture, it is not a

new thing revealed; yet we have also to charge him with a Fallacy purposely used, in the word *Spirit*, if taken personally, for the *Holy Ghost*, it is beside the case, if for His *Gifts*, or the manner of His dispensing of Himself to & by His servants, we have but his word for it, and that not very well agreeing to 1. Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6. and if his own Rule be true, viz. that *such mens Exposition as have no infallible spirit cannot be the word of God*, he hath thrown himself as well as us, and his book is to be little regarded, being full of Mistakes, Nonsense, & Lies: had he been infallible, he would not in his 12th Article against us, have charged that upon us which we never believed, much less professed.

Sect. 2. Here we have a great stir about the word (*Logos*,) but indeed a meer *Logomachy*, and lest he should not have senses enough to lose it in, he falls into *Tautologies*: Somebody might do well to ask him, what different sense he finds between, *Communication*, *Words*, *Talk*, & *Speech*? But the knack is, it signifies the Scripture only in a *thirteenth rare & improper sense*; and yet this is more than some of his friends will allow it.

But let that pass. He hath two or three *Queries* to puzzle us withal; though he takes upon him to answer them himself.



His first Query is, *Whether the Scripture contains all the Word or Words of God?* and that he demies, for the reasons already given, which are none at all: Well, if they will not fet us down, he will try what Scripture-Metaphors will do; and now we must observe that *The Word is compared to the Rain & Dew, Deut. 32. 2. and to Bread, Jer. 15. 16. Nam the drops of Rain & dew, and the small grains of flower in bread cannot be numbred; ergo the Scripture contains not all the Word of God.* But let us ask him (if he may be spoken to after such a profound Revelation as this) whether he allows it to be a good Interpretation of Scripture Allusions, to apply all that is in the thing alluded to, to that which it is compared with? or is it more safe to restrain it to that particular thing for which the Comparisson was made? Why then may not the Word be Resembled to the Rain & Dew, for the fruitful Efficacy of it on the hearts of God's people? and to Bread, from the spiritual Nourishment it affords? wiser men than G. K. have thought so.

As to his 2<sup>nd</sup> Question, it is meer Quibbling. We directly say, That *The Scriptures are properly the revealed Will of God, which was Metaphorically, and Anthropopathos called His Words, because God by them doth*

signifie



*Of new Revelations and Inspiration.*

signific to us His Mind, as we do ours to others by words, and this belongs to the Scriptures as they are written, or spoken.

To his last Question We only say, Let him first tell us, whether he intends the Grammatical sense of the words, or the Gracious sense of them upon the heart, and we shall know what to say to him. As for the sense in which he yields the Scripture to be the Word of God, he talks idly, confounding a *Metonym. Efficientis* with a *Metonym. Signi.*

*Reflections on Cap. 2. of New Revelations and Inspirations.*

The Fancy of *New Divine Revelations and Inspirations*, being the Pillar of Quakerism, it concerned him to treat the Scriptures with such caution, as to leave room to introduce this Figment, else he had undone his whole Cause: and yet it will be found that he hath granted so much there, that he must needs contradict himselfe here, as will be made evident.

In this Chapter the Dispute is, *Whether new divine Revelations & Inspirations of the Spirit of God be now ceased?* He undertakes the Negative against us: but indeed the whole is nothing else but meer *Legerdemain*.

The right Stating of the Controversie be-

between us, will abreviate and facilitate our work, in animadverting on this tedious and insignificant Chapter. In order to that, these three Terms, *Inspiration, Revelation & New* must be rightly understood. Words are used to express our *minds* by, & are to be taken in the sense commonly used among men; and when any are used *equivocally*, such as use them must have Liberty to interpret their own meaning.

As to the Word [*Inspiration*] it is vulgarly understood (in Divinity) to intimate an *Inward, extraordinary Discovery of the mind of God, made by the Holy Ghost in the hearts of His servants*; so, 2. Tim. 3. 16. and so we difference it from those ordinary and mediate wayes in which we come to this acquaintance. [*Revelation*] is applicable indeed to any way in which a thing is made known to us which we knew not before: and so the word may be (as sometimes in Scripture) applied to any Discovery which is made to us of the Will of God. But this word hath also attained a particular Appropriation to such a Knowledge of Divine Truths, as would never have been attained by the best Improvement of natural light or reason, without the Manifestation of the Spirit: and this is either *Immediate* or *Mediate*,  
the

The Immediate is the same with Inspiration:  
 and the Mediate is that which is commonly cal-  
 led *Illumination*, the Spirit of God helping us  
 with His Influences, whenever we are in the  
 use of means. The word [*New*] may be ap-  
 plied either to the kind of the things revealed  
 and to the Act of Revealing. Here then our  
 use of self in this matter may be reduced to  
 these Heads. We do believe, 1. That Say-  
 ing *Illuminations* of the Spirit, influencing the  
 hearts of His people with the knowledge of  
 Christ and His Truths, are common & need-  
 ful to all Believers in all ages, *Rev.* 8. 9.  
 2dly. That in this sence, there are new Re-  
 velations made from time to time to God's  
 Children, i. e. *subjectively*, 2. *Pet.* 3. 18.  
 3dly. That such inspirations as the *Prophets*  
 and *Apostles* of old had, by which God dis-  
 covered His mind to them immediately, en-  
 abling them to declare these things to others,  
 were not common to believers in these times.  
 1. *Cor.* 12. 29. & *vers.* 10. 4thly. That the  
 Scriptures do so fully contain the mind of  
 God in all things necessary for Faith and Sal-  
 vation, that there need no such *Inspirations*  
 to be afforded to any and therefore they are  
 now ceased. 2. *Tim.* 3. 16. 17. with *Heb.* 1.  
 1. 2. 5thly. That therefore there are no  
 new Revelations made, since the Canon was  
 perfected

perfected, of things or Doctrines which are not contained in the Scriptures, we are therefore directed hither for our establishment against Seducers, 2. *Tim.* 3. 13, 14. and not to abide by this, is to make it appear that *they have no light in them*, *Isa.* 8. 20. If now we examine what he opposeth to this Doctrine, we shall find nothing but Fallacy and Foolery.

Sect. 1. His first charge here is upon the *Assemblies Confession*, in the very first Article, and truly, If men lay the first stone wrong, the whole Fabrick must be weakned thereby. That which he alledgeth against them, is, they are *admirably blind* in their bringing in particular Citations of Scripture; and we may retort, that he is *admirably base* in perverting their sense, and design in Citing of them. They had asserted several things in this paragraph, for proof whereof they directed to the Scriptures printed in the Margent, which he perversly reflects upon, as brought only to prove that one Assertion (which is not *totidem verbis* made by them) *That all new Revelation is ceased.* They had said that God had pleased to commit His declared and revealed will of things which concern man's salvation, wholly to Writing; for which they alledge, *Prov.* 2. 19, 20, 21. and do not these

these Texts assure us, that God has written His Word to us, and that this Word tells us what God saith, yea, and to speak otherwise is an evidence that men have no saving light in them? Which, by the way, tells us what to judge of the *Quakers* light; and one would think this is to purpose, and hath something of proof in it, and to the same purport are *Luc. 1. 2, 3, 4. Rom. 15. 4. Mat. 4. 4. & 7. 10.* They had again told us, That God had made Scriptures necessary; and for the Evidence, direct us to, *2. Tim. 3. 15,* and can Impudence deny the Inference from that Text? Finally they tell us, That the Scripture being thus given to be a Rule for Faith and Manners, and being completely sufficient to its ends, *The former ways of Gods revealing Himself are ceased,* for which they cite, *Heb. 1. 1, 2. 2. Pet. 1. 19.* which one would think, if joined with the former, especially *2. Tim. 3. 15, 16, 17.* might prove it. Doth not the Apostle *Heb. 1. 1, 2.* renounce the former ways in the times of the Law, to give place to this one and better in Gospel times; and what can he do that comes after the King? And does not the Apostle Peter in the fore-cited place, tell us there is a surer way than an Immediate voice from heaven? and what have *stars* to do when the Sun is risen?

risen? In summe, all these Scriptures, are brought to prove what G. K. confesseth, Cap. 1. Sect. 1, 2, 3. nor do we see what absurdity would follow, upon our granting that *New revelations* of any truth, not before made known, ceased, before John the Apostle deceased, though his other extraordinary gifts did continue.

Sect. 2. And pray what do we assert, but what he seems plumply to grant here viz, *That the rule to try all doctrines is completely contained in the Scriptures*: only the business is, that this must in no wise prove the ceasing of *new revelations*, or *inspirations*, or *prophecy*. Let it for the present suffice to say, that he who goes about to confound terms which are used for distinction, has some cheating trick to impose upon us: it hath therefore been the guise of *Hetericks* in all ages; but possibly he will interpret himself more fully in the next.

Sect. 3. Here therefore he furnisheth us with a Distinction, which if he will give security that he will stand by, & make it appear that he intends no more, we will try for an accommodation. We have already told the world, that we deny not *new Revelations*, *subjective* and *mediate*, i. e. that the Spirit of God blesteth the Use of means, Reading, Hearing,

are clearing, &c. with His Influence, opening the eyes of their minds, and giving them a spiritual Illumination; and if that be all he would have, he might have let us alone.

But when he comes to interpret himself, he pleads for the *Immediate & extraordinary* way of Revelation of these things, such as the Apostles had, whose understandings Christ opened at once, to understand the Scriptures, without ordinary helps, and upon whom the Holy Ghost came in cloven tongues, &c. which is far another thing, and of which the Quakers can make no proof.

Sect. 4. The Fallacy of this Paragraph (& indeed of the whole Chapter) lies in his confounding *Inspiration, Revelation, & Illumination*, which ought warily to be distinguished. That Christ by His Spirit doth give to His Children another sense of the Excellency, sweetness and Glory of divine Truths than *natural* men have, we believe, and experience confirms; but what is this to *Inspiration*? Here therefore for once, let us observe the main differences between *Inspiration* and *Illumination*: *Illumination* is common to all Believers: *Inspiration* is peculiar to some, as Prophets, Apostles, &c., as hath already been observed and proved. *Illumination* ordinarily accompanies the diligent Use of the means;

Rom.



Rom. 10, 17. *Inspirations* usually came upon men immediately, and without using any means for them. *Illumination* becomes habitual; *Inspiration* was transient, off and on. *Illumination* encreaseth gradually, *Inspirations* were greater or lesser, as God saw meet. Finally. *Illumination* is alwaies understood whenas *Inspirations* sometimes are not understood by such as had them. Dan. 12. 8.

His inference, viz. that on supposal of *Illumination*, or mediate Revelation, we must needs grant it to be the same in kind with what the Saints had of Old, is dubious. We ask him what saints he intends? If he means ordinary Believers, we grant it; if inspired Prophets, we deny it; for such *Inspirations* differ specifically from ordinary Revelations: and his spirit misinformed him, when he cited Cant. 2. 4. He brought me into his banquetting house, & again, He brought me into his wine-cellar. What again is there, when it is the same Text, and the same word, diversly rendred?

His following *Rhapsody* in commendation of the Quakers silent Meetings we leave to themselves; for our own parts we have no such way of the Communion of saints, and yet let not any think that we deny the sweetness of retired Communion between God and the souls

sons of His People in secret prayer, meditation &c. his language therefore about it, toucheth us not.

To what purpose he ( p. 16. ) concludes this long Section with a Comparison taken from humane sciences, which are taught only to such as have innate principles in them upon which Teachers build, we know not, if it be ( as it seems ) to prove that men have the seeds of all Divine Truths in their natural light, and therefore the Revelations of God's Spirit are only the drawing out of these Principles into exercise, by the meer improvement of their Reason, and discovering only that the knowledge wherof they had in them seminally before; it labours of two faults, *Falseness* and *Impertinency*. *Falseness*, inasmuch, as, tho' the light of nature hath in it the Remains of many Theological notions, and tho' man, as a reasonable Creature, is a Subject capable of receiving the impression of Revelations, yet there are no seeds of Evangelical Truths in the hearts of men; nor is there, any witness antecedently in the Consciences of men, to assert to the Truth of them; the credit of them wholly depending upon divine Testimony. *Impertinency*, because it serv's not to prove new *Inspirations*, but rather to prove them needless; the

the meer Excitation of the light within, by his inward Teachings, being ( on this principle ) sufficient ; we hope he will not deny manifest difference to be between *Inspiration* and *Excitation* : nor is the Text he alledgeth ( *Act. 17.* ) any thing to his purpose if he would prove new Revelation from it ; for the Apostle is there only endeavouring to convince 'em, that the light of Nature would ( if attended ) inform them of the vanity of Idolatry, of the Being of the eternal God, of the Incongruity of their manner of worshipping Him ; & this in order to his preparing of them to hearken to the Revelations of the Gospel.

*Seet. 3.* How arrogantly and falsely he chargeth *Nonsense* upon the Reverend Assembly, for acknowledging *Illumination*, and denying of *New Revelation*, will be gathered from the premises, and needs not to be here again insisted on ; for indeed, inward Illumination is not Revelation in the sense wherein we deny it ; nor do his Texts cited help him ; for we still deny that every one who is taught of God is inspired, and he hath not proved it.

When he saith ( *p. 19.* ) *to be taught of God, &c. as the Prophets & Apostles, what is it but to be taught by Divine inward Revelation ?* It is a meer Sophism. We consider

*Of new Revelation and Inspiration.*

the Prophets and Apostles, either as such extraordinary Officers, or as they were Believers, for they had this double Capacity: to say that all were or are taught as they were, in the former sense is utterly false, as has been proved; to acknowledge them so in the latter sense, proves not such Revelations; yea, Paul himself, was not *alwaies* inspired, but sometimes gave his Judgment as one *illuminated*. 1. Cor. 7. 40. Nor can he prove, that 2. Cor. 2. 16. is applicable to all Believers in the same sense; the Revelation or Inspiration belonged to the Apostles, the Application, or discovery by *Illumination* belonged to all believers in their measures: how ungroundedly therefore does he here assert, that Paul holds forth that his *Illumination* was *Revelation*? must he not so contradict himself in 1. Cor. 12. 29, 30?

Nor can we altogether pass the scurrilous Title, he puts on the Reverend Assembly, calling them *Faith-Makers*; who never pretended to any new Revelations of any Article of Faith more than is contained in Scripture, and therefore have little Reason to be charged for making a new Faith. But if it were enough for the Archangel to say to the Devil, we content ourselves with so saying to one of his *Emissaries*, *The Lord rebuke thee*.

Sect. 6. Here he makes a Glutter between *Subjective* and *Objective Illumination*; he has no great matter to say against the Distinction it self; but he finds fault with us for denying *Objective Illumination*; but he might have spared his labour and heat, for if he will be patient, we will not deny that neither; i. e. That the Spirit of God reveals the *Object* to the soul, as well as enlightens the *Subject*, & if this will do, let him be quiet: only we say, He reveals no new object besides what is revealed in the Scripture, & we thought that he had said so too in this very Chapter, S. 3. But now he would insinuate ( p. 21. which he dares not speak out ) that he would have new *Truths*, or *Objects*, besides what are revealed in the Scripture, i. e. either expressly or consequentially, or he saith nothing; let him but reconcile his *third* and *sixth Paragraph*, and we shall know where to have him.

As for the Comparison by which he doth illustrate ( or rather scandalize ) our Doctrine, as if we acknowledged *No other sight of the Truth*, but as one that sees England in a map, but never saw the land, or one that hears and reads of meat, but never saw and tasted it: it is altogether aliene: we believe with the Apostle, that all our sight here is in a glass,

and that darkly or enigmatically, 1. Cor. 13. 12. and that we walk by faith, and not by sight. 2. Cor. 5. 7. and yet we believe that here is a spiritual feeling, & tasting, and satisfaction in all this, Heb. 11. 1. we are not therefore concerned in this peice of Raillery, with which his 22<sup>nd</sup> page is stuff'd; only we observe his spirit, like that of the primitive Persecutors, who clothed Christians in skins of beasts, and then worried them.

Sect. 7. We disallow not his Distribution of the knowledge of God into *Discursive* & *Intuitive*; but how poorly he improves it to his purpose, let the Reader judge: for if in the mean while our *Intuitive Knowledge* brings no new truths to us, but what are contained in the Word of God, he hurts not our Doctrine in the least. That *Intuitive* as well as *Discursive* Knowledge may be in diverse Christians in different degrees, we never questioned; but when he hath made all the plutter he can about his *intuitive* knowledge, he can never prove it to be any other than that inward Satisfaction which the Spirit of God affords to the minds of His people about the things that are contained in the Holy Scriptures, by the particular and personal Application of them to their hearts, and let G. K. or any other of his friends (if they

can ) produce any once instance to evidence that ever they had any *Intuitive Knowledge* of one divine Truth, whereof they had not a *discursive knowledge* before.

And how much he vilifies the Word of God by comparing it only to the *Cup which revealeth the wine*, and the Spirit to the *Wine in the Cup*, is plaine, *David* had another Opinion of the word, *Pf. 19. 7 &c.* and *Christ* giveth it another *Encomium*, *Job. 6. 63.*

Sect. 8. He introduceth an *Hypothesis*, *If they say, &c.* but who of us ever said so? make a *Castle in the Air*, and then discharge *pot-Guns* at it: but we do say, that all this makes nothing for his *New Revelations*, although it affords glad Tidings to the souls of God's Children.

Had he any Fore-head left him, he would never have here affirmed, that we *preach altogether an absent Christ*; we alwayes professed our selves to believe, That *Christ* is really and properly *present* with His people in His Ordinances and Application of Himself to them, only we say, He is so *spiritually* & not *corporally*, and it is strange that such pretenders to *spirit*, should deny a Reality and Property to it.

Sect. 9. What little Reason he hath to charge us with *Nonsense*, will be seen in what hath



hath been already said at the beginning of this Chapter: to which we refer the Reader. But how comes G. K. by so much modesty as to grant, That there is both *ordinary* and *extraordinary Revelation*, and that theirs is but *ordinary* and *pretends not an equality to that of the Apostles, either in degree or variety?* Some Quakers have been otherwise perswaded; else had their *Lucas* never said, *If thou hast a mind to a Scripture, thou maist write as good an one thy self.* But if he mean no other Revelation but what Christ did *Joh. 5. 25.* we allow it; only that differ'd more than in degree from what the Apostles had as such officers.

*Reflections on Chapr. 3d. of the Supreme Judge & Rule of Controversies in Religion.*

Let us not wrangle before we know what it is for. The Dispute here is about the *Judge or Rule of Controversies in Religion*: and observe, 1. That it is only about *Matters of Religion* 2. That *Judge*, and *Rule* here intend one and the same thing, *viz. the Standard by which things are to be tryed and judged.* 3. It refers to *Controversies*, i. e. where *principles* are in debate. Now wee'll suppose two kinds of *Controversies*, one between *men & men*, one party and another, each pretending to have truth on their side. The other between a man & *himself*, having a debate in his

own mind, and not being as yet settled. The Question then is, *What ( as a Rule ) is to set men down, & put an end to these Debates?* and let us go together as long as we can.

*Sect. 1.* He seems here to bid fair for an Agreement, at least in the first sort of the Controversy, i. e. between men & men, for we have only outwardly to deal one with another; and he assures us that *the Scripture is the Touchstone by which the Doctrine is to be tried*; and then sorely it must judge and determine, or what is the Advantage of Trying? Only he spoils all by telling us, *They have a greater proof, viz. the inward Testimony of the Holy Ghost.* We would only for the present ask him, ( though that is not all we have to say to him ) whether this inward Testimony be greater ( *as a rule* ) to judge another by, & set him down? and this because his words import that we are to judge by the Scripture whether the Testimony be from the Spirit or no; for in what other way can the *Spirit of the Prophets be subject to the Prophets?* else when a Quaker comes to tell us he hath a *Revelation*, and this is a Testimony above the Scriptures, it would be *impudence in us to search the Scripture, if the thing revealed be so or no.*

What though the Spirit witnesseth in us that this is the Rule, doth it hereby become

no Rule, or an inferior one? how absurd!

Sect. 3. Here also he begins fair, and would make us believe he is good natur'd, for he gives the Scripture a preference to all other Writings, and for that reason allows it to be a sufficient outward Standard; and one would think that were enough to try Controversies between men and men, and determine them, though his Reason is but awkward. Because Scripture-Writers had greater Measures of Wisdom &c. so that he allows them a gradual difference of Revelation, and not specifical, which may be judged of by what hath been already said, and what is it to us how or in what measures God revealed Himself extraordinarily to His Prophets, who pretend to no such Revelation at all? It sufficeth, that the lowest degrees of these Revelations were infallible, and therefore one Scripture is not less so than another: Nor shall we trouble our selves to prevestigate his Rabbinical Fopperies about the different degrees of Revelation, by which (no doubt he hath raised his credit much with the poor blind Quakers; whereas indeed, if a man had studied to make himself a Fool in print, he could not easily have done it more effectually; and though we grant, That God revealeth Himself gradually to His servants,

and to some more than to others; yet his Citation of *Exod. 6. 3.* proves not what he brings it for; it intends not that the Fathers did not know the Name *Jehovah*, (we find the Contrary, *Gen. 22. 14. 26. 24. 27. 20.*) but that He did in His providence rather exemplifie Himself by the name of *Almighty*, in Protecting and defending of the Patriarchs, but now He would most eminently display that of *Jehovah* in the compleating of the promises which He had made unto them.

In fine, he confesseth ( *p. 32.* ) That the Quakers degrees are so low that they are not in the state of Perfection, but they may by humane frailty in some measure or way, more or less ( tread softly ) decline or depart from the pure infallible teachings of the spirit; and then we hope this kind of spirit is not superior to that which spake infallibly in the Scripture; and from which we are assured that the Prophets, and Apostles in their Dictating or Writing the Scripture, did not decline in any measure or way more or less.

When he infers from hence, that *their Doctrine is to be tryed by the Scripture; and their spirit by the Spirit of Truth:* We would ask him what Difference he here puts between Doctrine and Spirit; and let him ( if he can ) shew how their spirit is to be tried but by  
their

their Doctrine, or what Spirit they can be tried by which will carry Conviction, but only that which breathes in the Scriptures: and it would be a great stroke he would drive, if he could reconcile our being led infallibly by the Spirit, to our being meanwhile in the same things left to mistakes; which is the very sense of his Words.

Sect. 3. Here also he will grant *the Scripture* ( *or the Spirit speaking in it* ) to be a Supreme Judge in a figurative sense, so we do not restrain it hither, but allow Him to speak something without Scripture: But this hath been already detected of vanity, for how shall we judge of the Spirit, but by the Scripture? That the Spirit of God must open our Understandings to discern the spiritual meaning of the word of God, we never doubted; and that Prayer and Meditation are helps to it, who questions? But what's this to the purpose? In summe, the Spirit is the Interpreter, but to call Him the Rule is Nonsense.

Sect. 4. We had waited long to know the Reason why, *Cap. 1. S. 1.* he calls the Scripture the *Outward Rule*, and now he fairly tells us, viz. *Because the Spirit is the inward rule. i. e. To determine all Controversies, at least such as we have in our selves a debate about.*

The Text alledged is impertinent, for the Testimony of God there spoken of is the Scripture witnessed to by the Spirit: and we must distinguish between the Testator & the Testimony, the latter of which can in any proper sence be called the Rule, and let it here be well observed, That the Scripture is a Judge in it self, and doth alwaies carry the Determination in it, whether we understand it or no, so as to be able to make use of it as such. And further, That it is not necessary that we have a *saving Illumination* for the meer *Doctrinal* improvement of it, since the Scripture is delivered in humane Language, and there is a logical knowledge of it to be attained by Industry, so far as to decide Controversies in Religion, by such as are not savingly illuminated, nor is it the spirit of the Disputant, but the convincing light of the word of God it self, which is to sway our Judgements and set them down satisfied as to the Doctrine.

Reflections on Chapt. 4th. of *Ministerial Gifts* &c.

It will be superfluous to quarrel with him about his method, since we are necessitated to follow him in his own path.

*Sect. 1.* He hath eased us of some Trouble,

Trouble by acknowledging, that the things contained in this Chapter have a close connection with the matter of the preceding, i. e. if his Doctrine about *Revelation & Inspiration* will not hold, neither will the ensuing: there will therefore (having already detected the Fallacy of those) be need of little more than brief touches at the things here asserted.

His Charge in this Section, that we assert, *Natural and acquired gifts of letter Learning* (without a *divine Inspiration*) to be sufficient to qualify a *Gospel Minister*, and that *Grace or true Piety is only accidental*; may look black at the first view: but let our Judgement in that point be fully weighed, and we shall have no reason to be ashamed of it.

That a man may be so Qualified, as to be capable of being Called to the Office of a Minister by a *Gospel Church*, and yet not truly pious, we fear not to assert, but still we believe that no man can discharge any Office of Trust acceptable to God, without saving Grace. We here presume (and shall have occasion to prove it anon) That there's a *mediate Call* necessary to introduce a man into the work of the Ministry; since the Apostles times; and they who are to call them, must have some rule of discerning to regulate their Call by, which must be something discern-



discernible ; that their piety cannot be discerned as such, he will anon put us upon proving : If therefore this were necessary to the Essence of the Officer, we could never know who is, or who is not a *Minister*. But *de facto*, Christ Himself, condemns the Scribes and Pharisees for *Hypocrites*, and yet acknowledged their *Office*, Mat. 23. 2, 3. Christ Himself made *Judas*, not only a *Minister*, but an *Apostle* ; we shall shortly see what he had to say against this. As for his Asserting that by divine Revelation a Quaker can infallibly know a mans spiritual estate, it is precarious, presumptuous and false : for tho' God knowes all mens hearts, yet that He gives infallible Rules to know them by, ordinarily or immediately cannot be evidenced : the Apostles themselves never pretended to it, but were often mistaken : *Judas* was not suspected by his fellow-Apostles ; *Simon Magus* past for a while, till he discovered himself ; *Demas* went long unsuspected, & was in high credit with *Paul* : We acknowledge that men may discover themselves by such things as are inconsistent with saving Grace and by this way we have too much Cause to be perswaded by Scripture Rules, that G. K. is an Apostate and an unsanctified man, but all mens sins do not (like his) go before

to Judgement.

His Inference then, That Hence a man cannot be known to be a true Minister without this discovery, is vain: he can by our Doctrine, which is according to Scripture, tho not by him which is altogether unscriptural; our People therefore are left in no perplexity about it.

Sect. 2. His Assertion, That No man can be a true Christian without Divine Inspiration, is hither-to unproved by him, and disproved by us: and were it true (as it is otherwise) his Consequence, viz. That without the same none can be a Gospel Minister, is inconsequent: nor is it any absurdity to say, That a man may be a true Minister, and yet not a true Christian, i. e. he may be orderly called to the Office of the Ministry, though yet he may not be savingly brought home to God: There is therefore an Ambiguity in the word [True] which may be applied either to the Professors or to the Profession.

Sect. 3. He mistakes the Apostles meaning, when he distinguisheth between the ministers of the letter and of the spirit, 2. Cor. 3, 6. for that whole Context assures us, that by the Letter he means the Old Testament, by the Spirit the New Testament, and the Reason of his so Calling them, is thence

thence easie to be gathered.

His arguing the Necessity of Saving Grace because, *Spiritual gifts are requisite*, is altogether illogical, nor doth it at all help him, because these also were purchased by Christ for he hath purchased other things for us besides Grace. That there is a specifical Difference between Gifts and Grace, is certain (though both may meet in the same man, & we seek for both in every Minister, to the best of our discerning) that these are separable is beyond doubt; that a man may have Grace, and yet not spiritual gifts G. K. (implicitly at least) acknowledgeth; yet Christ purchased Gifts for men, not meerly for the Salvation, but mainly for the Edifying of the Body, we are told Eph. 4. 10, 11. that therefore because a man must have spiritual gifts to make him a Minister, he must have saving Grace, is a *Non Sequitur*.

Sect. 4. And that these *Spiritual Gifts* were discernable we deny not. There is a fair & easie Tryal to be made of them: but his inference that therefore They could discern whether men were true or false Apostles & Teachers, sincere or Hypocrites, is to be better weighed: That false Apostles might be proved by their false Doctrine. is nothing dubious: That Hypocrites might discover themselves

by their fruits is also easy to acknowledge; but that in themselves, without any such Effects, and meerly by their looks, there was, or is a spirit of immediate discerning them, is utterly untrue; neither hath he given us one Rule to direct us in it. As to his Citation of 1. Cor. 4. 19. to prove this discerning, it helps him not, for the Apostle speaks, & not there of their *inward* Grace, but of the fruits and effects of their Ministry, or of the Conformity of their Conversation to their Doctrine.

And whereas he censures us for *Limiting one man to preach only*, it is not true; we admit of one to preach one part of the day, and another on the other part, where they are to be had: only we require that they be such as are fit for the Ministry; and we would not have others to do it. Nor did the Apostle intend that there should be any Confusion in this Affair, 1. Cor. 14. 29. &c. and to very little purpose doth he quote 2. Tim. 3. 5, 6, 7. (though we see what he would be at) for that is not appropriated to Teachers, but applicable to all Professors; nor did we ever plead that *Scandalous Ministers* whose Conversation is contradictory to their Profession & Doctrine should be continued in that Function, when once they are discovered

discovered to be such. We therefore concede to him, that there ought to be a *Trial of men*, and (if he will too) that it is not merely whether what they preach be true Doctrine, but a great deal more; yet it must of necessity, be either of his Doctrine, his Ministerial gifts, or his Life, or rather all three beyond which we are to seek of what Trial can be made by men; for man judgeth and must judge, according to what can be known and the Searching of the heart is GOD's Privilege.

Sect. 5. That because we pretend not to Inspiration, therefore we lay no claim to these spiritual gifts, is an Argument as vain as the author: Are there no Spiritual gifts but Inspirations? are there not diversities of them? see 1. Cor. 12. 4, 5. Rom. 12. 6, 7. 8. His Inference, That hence We plainly confess that we have no infallible Discerning who is gracious, we assent unto; and yet we do believe we can discern of this as much as G. K. or any of his friends: and his Charge that we plead that all spiritual gifts are ceased, is notoriously false, for we try men by them; and we are sure that these may continue, notwithstanding the Cessation of Inspirations; nor can he infer the Contrary, till he prove (which he never will) that all spiritual Gifts belong

long to the head of *Inspirations*: Hence  
 neither doth it follow, that we must deny an  
 inward Call to the ministry; since there are  
 other *Criteria* by which it may be judged of,  
 a sufficient Directory for which, we have in  
 the *Scriptures*, and have a power of *Reason-  
 ing & Judging* without immediate *Revelation*.  
 For him therefore to urge, That *All that is*  
*not by Inspiration* [ *Church, Ministers, Ordin-*  
*ances, Worship* ] *must needs be of man's making,*  
 is insolent: Must every thing that is not by  
*Inspiration* be *Man-made*? Hath not Christ  
 set *Institutions* for His Church in His Gospel,  
 that may sufficiently inform them in their  
 Duty? It is the *Quakers* that make Church-  
*es, and Ordinances, silent-meetings &c.* under  
 a deluded pretence of *Inspiration*, without  
 any *Scripture Warrant*.

On the same blind and perverse notion it  
 is that he chargeth us with plainly confessing  
 that we have no *Assurance*, or *Infallible Know-*  
*ledge* that we have the *Spirit of God*, or any of  
 that *Grace* which is the operation of the *Holy*  
*Ghost*. For, First the Charge is false, and  
 all the world knows that we stand to main-  
 tain *Infallible Assurance*, against both Papists  
 and Quakers and who ever deny it. And  
 2ly. We are satisfied this may be had with-  
 out *Immediate Revelation*: A man may have  
 the

## Of Ministerial Gifts &c.

The perception of such Operations in him which by *Scripture Rules* he may be able to judge of, that they are of the Spirit of God, he himself aiding them in this *Examen*: and for what other end were all these Rules given but to help us herein? *Rom. 8. 3. Heb. 12. 14. 1. Joh. 3. 14.* and many others.

His Cavil about *Effective* and *Objective illumination* is already answered, and it is an odious Aspersions that he casteth upon us, *That we make men stones, that have no inward perception of what is acted upon their hearts*; we believe that Grace hath a spiritual sense; and when the Spirit of God Influenceth it, it can feel it: only there is Corruption in us too, and the Spirit of Delusion sometimes excites that, under close pretences, which requires our Application to the *Word of God* for a Determination, *Isa. 8. 20.* His abuse of *Heb. 12. 27.* interpreting the Apostle, by *things made* to intend things of men's making is most gross, For it is certain these things were of God's making, viz. the *Old Testament-Ordinances* which were now to be taken away to give place to *Gospel Institutions* of Christ's Appointment; and these are the *Church, Ministry &c.* which we maintain. But let any man pursue him in this Paragraph, and he shall perceive, that his  
very



very design is to take away all Gospel Ordinances and worship and reduce all to *Inspirations*; the Tendency whereof, to subvert the whole designe of Christ in his Gospel, is sufficiently Observable; for that all these were there instituted is undeniable, That therefore must be *antiquated* if this take place, contrary to *Heb. 12. 28.* and let serious souls beware of such as would rob them of the Gospel.

His Sophisms in Charging us of Blasphemy, for saying, *We have the Spirit of God*, and yet saying, *we have no infallible spirit*; as if therefore *we charged the Spirit of God Himself of being fallible*, may seem to have some influence upon weak minds, ( see pag. 41 ) it may therefore need a little Discussion: Observe then, that the Evidence which we have within us of the Certainty of our spiritual State, or of any spiritual motions in us, is confirmed by two witnesses, *God's Spirit*, and *our own*, *Rom. 8. 16.* and these are two distinct witnesses, ( the *Quakers*, indeed, have blasphemously confounded them, and made them but one ) now we acknowledged & believe that the witness of the spirit of God is *Infallible*, He cannot be deceived, neither will He deceive by witnessing to a falsehood; but the witness of our own spirit is *Fallible*;

E

because

because we are persons liable to mistakes. Now, tho' the Spirit when He witnesseth doth it *Infalibly*, yet He doth not make our spirits *Infalible*; and more than so, the Spirit of God witnesseth as He will: sometimes He withdraws His Testimony, and His Witness is commonly *mediate*, it is with our spirits: Now, the way in which our spirits witness is *rational*, i. e. by searching our state. or examining the Suggestions in us, & bringing these things to the Rules of Tryal given in Scripture, 2. Cor. 13: 5. In both the Examination and Tryal we may be mistaken, for we know but *in part*, and yet so far as the Spirit of God confirms us by His Witness, we are infallibly assured.

We find also, that the inspired men of old (such as *Paul*) did not declare all things to the people by *Immediate Revelation*, but some things as they were *skilful understanding* Christians, influenced with the ordinary Assistances of the Spirit of God, and rationally Judging of things: Hence *Paul's* distinction, 1. Cor. 7. 12, -- 25. and therefore the words alledged, verse, 40. *I think*, &c. (for all his Railery) speaks thus much, That he did not suggest these Advices (by *immediate Inspiration*, but by the Common Assistances that God affords His faithful Ministers.

## Of Ministerial Gifts &c.

Sett. 6. How blasphemously doth he in this Section ascribe the effects of the Scripture to the *Ministers*? he would have no Minister but such through whom grace, spirit and life do emanate to the souls of the hearers; making them more than merely instrumental in Converting and Edifying. We deny not but that a gracious Minister is more likely to do good than another, but not by any power of his own, but because, as he will be more faithful, so he may expect more of Gods Assistance and Blessing: but that he can by any Virtue of his own, any more heal a Soul, than those Apostles could the body of a Cripple, ( who utterly disclaim it *Act. 3. 12.* ) we believe not, and we are confirmed by the Scripture, *Joh. 1. 13.* And truly the Quakers want Charity, if they have such a virtue to Convert and save all the world, and do not.

His Similitude of Ministers being called *Flames of Fire* ( if it intend *Ministers*, and not rather *Angels* ) is not Argumentative, they may be so compared, for their Activity, and Zeal, and not from the Efficacy in themselves. And as little Cogent is his Instance of the Disciples, *Luc. 24. 32.* for he forgot that Christ Himself was then the Preacher, who had a Divine Power; and

yet we deny not but that the same may be said of the preaching of another, but then it is the Spirit of God coming in between the mouth of the Speaker, and the hearts of the hearers who doth it, yea, though Christ had the Spirit without measure, yet how often did He preach without such Efficacy? hence His Complaint, *Isa.* 49. 4. Yea, there were more plentiful Conversions after His Ascension, by His Apostles, when the Holy Ghost was given, *Act.* 2. The Scripture by which he would prove this, *1. Pet.* 4. 11. is nothing to his purpose; For the Ability there spoken of, is an outward estate enabling them to give Alms, and more especially concerneth the office of the Deacon in Relieving the poor out of the Church Treasure, which must be done according to the stock in hand; and what is this to an inward Power of Converting souls?

Nor doth he more exalt his Ministry than he degradeth the Word of GOD, denying it to be the *Milk*, which is to nourish us; making it nothing but a *Bottle* that carries this Milk; and yet the Scripture he alludes to, calls it the *Milk*. However, let it be the *Bottle*, still we must go to that for our Nourishment, and draw it out of those breasts, and then there is no need of Imme-

*State Inspirations.*

His Comparing *Ministers* to *Fathers* is Scriptural; but the *Improvement* of the Similitude is his *own*, and like him. There are some things in which there is a likeness between these, which gave occasion to the Comparison, but yet they are far unequal Causes. A natural Father is a *Father* properly, for all *G. K.* denies it, and is something more than an *Instrument*, he is a *natural Efficient*, a *procreant cause*, but the Minister is not so in the *Spiritual Regeneration*, but merely instrumental ( which he also grants ) and then ew-born Christian derives no part of his new Nature from him, *Job. 1. 13.* And as unhappy is his improvement of the Metaphor of *Seed*, *2. Cor. 9. 10. Isa. 55. 10.* The former of which Texts only intends, that God hath given them an estate to be able to relieve others withal; the latter is of the Word it self; ( which is likened to grain, which the Minister only soweth ) and which taketh rooting in the heart; and fructifies; and what is all this to the Ministers being able to *convert*? or what Force will it give to his Inference, *Viz. How then can a graceless man have any fruit or success*; seeing all fruit and success belongs not to the instrument as proceeding from it? It's easily retorted,

Why may not God ( if he will ) make use of such men to convert others by, since it depends not on them but Him? Herein He may make His power the more to appear tho' we have already said, we beleeve that God ordinarily blesseth the labours of the faithful with the greatest success. But we limit Him not.

Sect. 7. Nor are we *pinched* or *narrowed* ( as he insultingly if not triumphantly boasts ) to prove our *Call to the Ministry*, notwithstanding we deny it to be *immediate* : nor yet are we necessitated to prove it *mediate* by deriving it from the Pope, who is *Antichrist*. We are not straitned about a Succession, as if that only would make a *Call mediate* ; ( tho' we beleeve that Christ hath had a Church, and a Ministry continued alwaies ever since the Apostles. ) A man's *Call to the Ministry* is either *Inward* or *Outward* ; neither of these is *Immediate* : not the *Inward Call*, or the persuation which a man has that God calleth him ; he hath it not by *Revelation*, but by *Investigation*, for which ( besides his Inclination to it ) he must prove his own Fitness for it, which must be by the mediate Application of himself to Scripture Rules, and judging of himself by them. His *Outward Call* is also *mediate*, *Viz.* by men, on whom he has

no warrant to impose himself; and should he say he hath a *Revelation* for it, yet if he cannot prove it by Scriptures, G. K. believ's they have no Obligation to Credit him; whereas an immediate Call is neither of men nor by men. *Gal. 1. 1.*

Sect. 8. Having routed the *Ministers* (in his arrogant Opinion) now to pulling down the *Ordinances*: and good reason they should go together: and here (because *Preaching* is *ipso facto* cashier'd with the *Preacher*) he only levels his Canon against *Praying & Singing without Inspiration*: and that both publick & private. and,

1. For *Prayer*, he sends a Challenge to produce one Instance in Scripture, where *Praying without the Spirit* is commanded. We discover his Dilemma, and shall avoid the Horn: If being commanded to pray without the Spirit be taken in *sensu Composito*, i. e. to live content in a Graceless, *Spiritless* state, and yet pray; or to rest in our natural Abilities without seeking the Aids of the Spirit of God; we believe there's no such Command in the Word of God: But if it be taken in *sensu Diviso*, i. e. that aswel men without the Spirit, as such as have the Spirit are under a Command to pray, we affirm it, & can give both Proof and Instance for it.



*Prayer* is a moral Duty, and Want of Grace dischargeth none from moral Obligations ; for if it did, none of the apostate Race of *Adam* would come under Condemnation. That *Simon Magus* had not the *Spirit*, or *saving Grace*, we are sure, and yet *Peter* commands him to pray for Grace and Conversion. He is also much mistaken in saying, *Do they not grant that all the prayers recorded in Scripture proceeded from Divine Inspiration and Revelation?* We never granted it, never will. The Scriptures themselves were written by Inspiration ; but all the things there written of were not so. *Abraham* prayed for *Ishmael*, by a natural affection sanctified: and *Paul's* Praying thrice against his thorn, was from a Sence of the Affliction, and a Religious Persuasion that he was to go to God as Him who only could help him, which he knew without Inspiration.

2. As for *Singing* : he doth not Condemn the thing, for fear he should provoke his Friends the *Singing Quakers* : but two Things he has to Charge us guilty of, *Singing with artificial musick, & Notes or Tones, and singing on a Book* : To the first, 'tis so foolish, that it is not worth a Reply ; for would he have singing without singing ? What Melody can there be without *Notes, & Tones* measured

measured by Art? Doth he think *Singing* is only making a confused *Noise*? or doth the *Spirit* tune mens voice by *immediate Inspiration*? or are men only to sing in the *Spirit*, i. e. sing and not sing? To the 2<sup>nd</sup>. *Singing on a book* pleads nothing for *praying on a book*, having different Reasons. In *prayer* there is but *one speaks*, and the other are only to join their *Amen*; but in *Singing* there is to be a joint Expressing themselves, by *all* the Community; there must therefore be a *known* matter that is to be sung, and that in such a Meeter as is accommodable to the Tune sung by them; the very nature of the thing calls for this: and sure he will not say all this will come at once to all alike by *immediate Inspiration*. Till therefore we can find better, we may make use of *David's* which are suited to all Conditions of Gods people. These Christ Himself with His Disciples made use of, and that at the Sacrament, *Mat. 26. 30. When they had sung an Hymn*, which is a Scripture Title of some of *David's Psalms*, which are distributed into *Psalms, Hymns* and *Songs*, to which the Apostle adviseth Christians, *Col. 3. 16.* and these we are sure were given by *Inspiration*; That any now made by men are so, :here is nothing to prove.

Sect. 9. It is a pure peice of trifling whereby he would baffle the Plea which some make, *Viz. That their Ministers have their Call of the Church, and therefore it is mediate*; by telling us that *Ministers were before Churches, and that this is to run in a Circle*: for though we place not the whole of a Ministers Call in this, yet his Cavil is empty, In order to the Calling of a Church, we grant that Ministers are before it, and are Helps under Christ in the Calling of it and such Christ used in the beginning of the Gospel, but these were called *extraordinarily & immediately by Christ Himself*: but such Ministers do not *live for ever*, and the Church abides when they are gone; and is now in a Capacity of Supplying it self, and so there is room for a *mediate* Call; and what *Circle* is there in this? There are *Planters*, & there are *Waterers*; and *both* Ministers.

Sect. 10. One blow more at the Ministers to make sure work. These are Eye-sores of Quakers and all Hereticks; if they were out of the way, who discover all their abuses, detect all their Fallacies & deceits, and establish people in the Truth; what might they not do? If then they cannot perswade them to lay down their Preaching, they will try if they can perswade the people that they owe them

them no Maintenance, and if they can *starve them out*, the business is done.

His first proof that Ministers can *require no Maintenance but what is voluntary and of Charity*, is from 1. Cor. 9. 14. It would make any man of Reason out of Love with the Quakers Spirit, if it interprets Scripture so Diametrically opposite to the Letter; his Argument must needs run thus; *If God hath positively ordeined that Ministers of the Gospel shall have maintenance, then the people may chuse whether they will maintain them or no*; and it is observable, that the Apostle proveth this from the *Ordinances of the Old Testament*, relating to the Ministers of the *Tabernacle*, concerning whom we find, that God not only ordeined that they should be maintained, but *what* they should have. • And whereas he inferrs from hence, that *they must only have necessary Maintenance, and that but if they are poor, just to relieve them and no more*; it plainly contradicts the Apostle's Argument; for he pleads from the Care of God for the maintenance of the Old Testament Worship, and argues from the *lesser to the greater*: Now what Provision God made for the Priests & Levites, is to be conjectured by what is recorded in the Levitical Law. For, (as judicious men have computed,

puted, and see particularly, *Reinolds* on *Psal.* 115. page 477, 478. ) the Tribe of *Levi* was not a fourtieth part of the people, & yet had as much maintenance allowed them as three of the other Tribes. Nor is the Ministers Maintenance an Alms of Mercy, but a *Debt in Justice*, as the New-Testament fully clear-eth, *Gal.* 66. 1. *Tim.* 5. 17, 18. 1. *Cor.* 9. *per totum*: in which Chapter the Apostle proves it by many Arguments. And if it be due in *Justice*, how poorly doth he plead against the *Care of the Magistrate*, by *Lawes* to provide, *that it shall be duly defrayed*? All Acts of Justice come under the Cognizance of the Civil Magistrate, who is to see that all have their dues: nor does it prove any thing to the Contrary, that *Christ sent forth His disciples, prohibiting them from taking any thing, and yet they wanted nothing*: It was a Special Precept, and when Christ bids others to do so, they may rely on His providence; till then it would be to tempt, and not to trust it. Whereas therefore he saith, that there should be *no bargaining in this case*; it is built on the same mistake. There is a due, and it is lawful to use wayes of prudence to obtain it: his Example of *Paul* is aliene: What tho' he laboured with his hands, not to make the Gospel a Charge? yet we find 1.

Cor. 9. that he there so states the case, that no other should suffer because of his Example: proving that it was his due, if he should require it, that he did it for a peculiar Reason. Nay we find that though he took no wages of the Churches of Achaia, yet he did else where. 2. Cor. 11. 8, 9, 10. Nor for all his railing (will the Ministers in New-England be ever Charged with oppressing the people: and what though Paul and others extraordinarily gifted. in the new planting of the Gospel, and in times of Persecution sometimes laboured, and in part maintained themselves; must they therefore who must industriously use the meanes to help them in their work, who live in times and places of the peaceable Settlement of the Gospel, and among those that profess it, do so too? If they then did it voluntarily, alwaies asserting their own liberty to do otherwise, must we do it of Constraints?

Sect. 11. Once agen, he must have a sting at our saying that true piety is not essential to a Gospel Minister: What our Judgement is in this point, is already declared: he here only labours to enervate some of our Scripture proofs by Example.

1. For Judas; he cannot deny but he was a Minister, but tells us we cannot prove but he

had some measure of piety : if his popish Doctrine of *Falling from saving Grace* may hold, we may be at a loss, but if it be otherwise, ( as we shall have occasion afterwards to discuss ) it will be evident he never had any, for he died a graceless wretch.

2. For the *Pharisees*; whom Christ advised His followers to hear, as sitting in *Moses's Chair*; he saith, *their teaching belonged to the Law, and what's that to Gospel-times?* We reply, Whether *G. K.* or *Paul* were most infallible, judge ye; sure he insinuates that they were Gospel-Preachers, for he tells us the Gospel was preached to the people then, *Heb. 4. 2.* and by whom but by the Preachers?

3. That *Paul* rejoiced at the Gospel's preaching, though they had ill ends that preached it, *Phil. 1. 15, -- 18*; and Consequently they were ill men; he saith, 'tis nothing to the purpose, it justifies not their Preaching but commends the power and wisdom of God. And we say too, that it justifies not their so preaching; but it at least holds out thus much, That they were Preachers, and might do good by preaching: else he would not have rejoiced in it: his Comparison therefore from *Persecutors* is impertinent; for though God's people rejoice to see Truth to spread and flourish under Persecution, yet they do not therefore re-  
joice



joice for persecution ; whereas *Paul* not only rejoiced that there was good done by their preaching, but that *Christ* was preached by them.

*Reflections on Chapt. 5. Of God, His Decrees &c.*

Sect. 1. He introduceth this Chapter with a sad Complaint of abuse offered by the Presbyterian and Independent Teachers to the poor innocent *Quakers*, and that for nothing else but their using of *Scripture* words to express the *Mystery of God, the Father, Son & Holy Ghost* by. We should be sorry if any had so done: But before we are gotten over this Chapter, there will something else appear, for which they are not abused, but deal't justly with.

But there's more still ; they not only abused them in word, but persecuted them to Death, for nothing else but this, and some other things of like nature ; & them too, precious men-servants and maid-servants of the Lord. Sure they were irreligious and barbarous people that did this ; only there is a bold impudent *Lye* in the story. The persons he intends were *Quakers* ; and what precious saints they are, we leave others to judge, and the Crime which occasioned their suffering was, They came purposely to undermine the Civil Government

vernment, and perswade the people to Renounce it; which is every where accounted *Sedition*, and a *Capital Offence*: nevertheless the Rulers used utmost Lenity towards em, and all fair perswasions to have em depart: yea, they banished and sent them away: but they willfully returned, yea, resolutely and daringly affronted them. Now this seems to be a diverse Case from what he pretends, but a Quaker sticks at nothing that serves his cause.

And now he pretends to give an account of their faith about the Trinity;

But it is a new Quakers-Creed, nor is he so ignorant as to believe, that *that* was their faith in those times, or for many years after.

*Seet. 2.* But all this Harangue was for nothing else, but to introduce the Discourse about God's being *Light*, and vent a few *light-headed* Notions about it. First he finds fault that in our *Confession* we omitted the *Attribute of Light*, and smells an ill design in it. Truly the Intreague was meerly this, The Reverend Divines intended only to express such Attributes as were proper and not *metaphorical*; and unto which all such *Metaphors* might be reduced: of this nature is that of *Light*, and is included in their saying, He is most *Wise*: and for G. K. to say,

*It is no figurative or Tropical Expression,* argues him either of grossest ignorance, or boldest Confidence.

And now he hath gotten the Notion of *Light* in his head, how strangely doth he plead for *Immediate Revelations and Illuminations* in such *Seraphical* terms as must needs transport his Reader. Well then, we are all in the *Light* as well as he. *GOD* is an *Immense Light*, and then, *Hell* it self dwells in His *Light*; and *Devils* must needs be full of *Immediate Inspirations*: and 'tis a Contradiction for a Quaker to tell us that we are in the dark for we live and move and have our being as much in the *Light* as he. But all this is *Burlesque*; a good distinction would cure him, were he capable of receiving it. Distinguish between *Divine Light* & *natural*, and their different way of Communicating themselves. The *Sun* is a *natural Light*, & *Illuminates* all the things that it shines upon: the *Divine light*, is the *Infinite Omniscience & Wisdom of God*; but though in Him it be *infinite*, yet He derives of it to the Creature, not *naturally* but *voluntarily*, not to all alike, *Job. 35. 10.* And He chuseth what Medium He sees meet to communicate it by.

We thought he would soar till he grew giddy, his brains turn'd, and so speaks Non-

sense; and let it come out; *Light*, he tells us, is immediate though it comes thro' a Medium; i. e. its immediate, though it be mediate: but let that pass. Whereas he cites *Plato* (who is with him little inferior to *Moses*) to prove that *It is man's Infelicity to converse with Images of things*; we accept not the Testimony; for Man was made to Converse with the Images of things, and shall so Converse for ever in his perfect state of glory; this being the nature of his understanding, to receive the Knowledge of things by taking in the Images.

And what he seems to insinuate, p. 62. viz. That the Word of God hath no more of God in it than a glass window hath of the Sun, is in no wise to be admitted: Its true, we are said to see in a glass, 1. Cor. 13. 12. which comprehends the Scripture, but then it is not a Perspective glass, but a Looking-glass that is alluded to: and it is certain, that God hath imprinted the image of His preceptive will there: and the Scripture is adapted to discover much of God to us by its own light, else all the Encomiums given to it *Psal.* 119. *Prov.* 6. 23. and else-where, are Hyperbolical.

Sect. 3. The Blasphemy charged upon us for Calling (as he saith) the light of God in

*His people, a stinking vapour from bell; will light upon their side, who call the poor imperfect light of nature, God & Christ, as they have done in many of their books: but more of this afterwards.*

He here arraigns the Assembly for that in *Confess. cap. 26. sect. 3.* they say, that the *Communion of saints with Christ doth not in any wise make them partakers of the substance of His God-head; and endeavours to prove the contrary to be true.* But observe, the Assembly in this Article oppose the *Swenkfieldian Doctrine*, that *a beleever is Godded with God, and Christed with Christ:* and this is the thing that *G. K.* is here to prove, or he does nothing. That we are *made partakers of the divine nature, that we have near and intimate Communion with God and Christ; that we receive grace out of Christs fulness, and that God is our portion, we beleieve.*

But a right Conception of the Mystery of our Union and Communion with God and Christ, will soon detect his Fallacies: Union is the ground of Communion; and therefore, such as is the Union: such is the Communion. Now this Union is one of the Gospel Mysteries, *Eph. 5. 32.* only this much we know to our present purpose; *1.* That it is an Union between two, *VIZ. Christ and*

*Beleivers.* 2. That these two are made one by this Union, *Joh.* 17. 21. 3. That they are so one, as that they are still *two Persons*, two distinct in nature; It is an *Union*, but not a *Confusion*; they are so one, as the *Husband* and *Wife* are one, who are two persons, but one in Relation, and the fruits of it, *Eph.* 5. 32. God is God, & man is man still. 4. That this Union is made by Faith on our part, by which we take possession of Christ: and His Spirit on *His* part, by which He dwells in us, *Gal.* 3. 26. 1. *Cor.* 6. 7. 5. That by Virtue of this Union God in Christ becomes the *Beleivers Portion*, *Lam.* 3. 24. 6ly. That God in Christ communicates Himself to them according to their Capacity, and that is by way of *Efficacy* and *Influence*. Hence, 1. All His Divine Attributes are employed for their Benefit, *Deut.* 33. 27 *Exod.* 34 6, 7. 2ndly. the Spirit of Christ dwells in them by His Influence, *Rom.* 8. 11. 3dly. Christ as a Fountain of Grace derives streames down to them, having a stock put into His hands as Mediator, *Joh.* 1. 16. 4thly. They are made to share with Him in His Mediatorial Glory. *cap.* 17. 24. But what is there in all this of our being *Deified*, or *Christed*? which if he intend not, he hath said nothing to the purpose.

When

When he saith, *If they partake neither in His God-head nor manhood, they partake not in Him substantially*; wants Logick. We say they partake in His *graces*, and they are *substantial* things: and then he chargeth us for saying, that *Graces are nothing but Accidents*, we utterly deny it, we say they are neither the soul nor the body, but they are *Adjuncts*; and he might have learn'd to distinguish between *Adjuncts* and *Accidents*. *Graces* are *Adjuncts* to men, because they are separable without destroying their Humanity; this G. K. beleeves, and all that deny perseverance must believe it: they are not meer *Accidents*, because *Accidents* cannot receive *Accidents* nor *Qualities* as *Adjuncts* may, and *Graces* do; hence the *Epithetes* put upon them in Scripture. But he goes about to make *Graces* to be the very Divine Substance, because they proceed from *GOD*; When as if he had studied the Doctrine of God's Efficiency, he would have known better. Nor doth the Doctrine of Dr. Owen, or Mr. Rutherford, in the words of theirs which he Cites, at all run into the Quakers Blasphemy; for who doth not acknowledge the Person of the Holy Spirit, and the Person of Christ in their Operations, for they are personal acts, and therefore the *Person*



of the Holy Ghost dwells in us by his *Operations*, &c. And in summe, we beleeve that that there is a Divine Act or Influence on us, as in Creating so in assisting our grace; but our reaction of that grace is not God, but an exercise of that principle which is created in us, for *Grace* it self is a *Creature* Eph. 4. 24.

Sect. 4. Here he chargeth our Doctrine referring to the Divine Decrees, to be the same with that of *Ranters*; which is an abusive slander and we shall make it appear to be far otherwise; for, supposing them to agree with us in one principle, viz. *That God doth all, & hath unchangeably ordered all things good & bad*; are we therefore *Ranters*? We deny not every thing that *G. K.* saies, but that does not make us *Quakers*. May there not, (nay, & there not) a vast difference between their Interpretation & Improvement of this Article and ours? But had he well studied the Doctrine of *Divine Concurrence*, he would never have said, either, *That If God decrees all things, He must needs be the Doer of them*, or, *that hence he must needs be the Author of Sin*, for all our denying any such Consequences. This Doctrine is so fully handled by all that have written Systems of Divinity, or that have waded in Controversies between us and the

the Jesuits & Arminians, that it would be superfluous here to search into it. Let only two or three Conclusions that are to our present purpose be observed, Viz. That, firstly All creatures depend absolutely upon God, as in respect of their Being, so of all their Actions, *Act. 17. 28.* 2ndly. That this dependance is not only for a general sustentation of the Being & powers of the Creature, but for influence into every individual Action, *Joh. 19. 11.* 3dly. That Notwithstanding this Influence upon the creature, in respect of its Action, the Creature hath its Action of its own, subordinate to, and assisted by this Influence, *1. Cor. 3. 9.* 4thly. That Sin is a moral respect which the Action bears, as it is done by the creature, who is under the Law, *1. Joh. 3. 4.* and therefore it cannot touch God. And his interpretation of that *Eph. 1. 11.* that [all things] intends only all things that He doth, is true; but his Inference, Viz. That when we say a man doth all things by Wisdom, none will be so foolish as to infer that he doth all foolish things, is a foolish Similitude: for to argue from a particular Agent to an Universal Efficient, by making them paralel, is Folly. Besides, tho' they are Follies of second Causes, yet there is the wise Conduct, even of these things, by the

*First Cause* ; and it is none of the least discoveries of His Wisdom, that He conducts the follies of creatures to the Exaltation of His own Glory : but any man may here perceive, that he is restoring *Manicheism* to the world, as if there were two principles or first Causes, the one of good the other of evil.

That we have him ( page. 72. ) making a large Concession of the Substance of what we believe, seems to intimate that he labours between Conscience and Interest ; except it be, that he would perswade silly souls to think that we have some strange Mysteries in our Doctrine that others cannot see.

But this hath been but a Digression from the matter in hand, Viz. the Universal Decree, and now he will glance at it again : endeavouring to enervate our plea from *Act. 2. 23.* ( where he joins us again with Ranters ) by a distinction between *Delivering & Slaying* ; but we so distinguish too, and yet that God only exposed Christ to them, is not the whole meaning of the Text ; for it certifies us that this was done according to an eternal purpose of God, who had appointed in that way to bring about mans Redemption, using them as Instruments ( tho wickedly abusing their free will ) in these sufferings of Christ, by which we were Redeemed. Compare Chapt.

Chapt. 4. Vers. 27, 28. and it will clearly appear, that God hath certainly decreed all things from Eternity, which come to pass in time, to him, that shall consider.

1. That God is the Supreme Efficient or Worker of all things, according to His Counsel, Eph.

1. 11. 2ndly. That God foreknew from all Eternity what should be done by all Creatures in time: this G. K. pretends to believe; and let him or any of his Company tell us how He did so in respect of voluntary Agents, unless he had predestinated them.

What he saith of Gods Hardning of men, That it is by His withdrawing of His Spirit from them, is a Truth, but not the whole Truth, there is more contained in it; sometimes it is by denying them softning meanes, sometimes by presenting before them Objects, sometimes by a judicial delivering em up to Satan, & their own hearts lusts; and all these wayes are according to Scripture.

Sect. 5. Here we are told that the honest Quakers believe all that the Scriptures say, concerning Election; and who would desire more? But if they believe not the things which the Scripture necessarily intends, they prevaricate, for the mind of the Word is the Word, and now see how it will appear, he presently tells us, that *We no where find in Scripture*

that

that God reprobated any part of mankind before the foundation of the world. That He made 'em on purpose to damn them, is none of our Doctrine, but Scandalously imputed to us: We say He made them for the glory of his Justice, which is exalted in their Damnation, procured by their own fault; and for proof, follow him but three or four lines, and he confesseth as much himself, or else he speaks he knows not what; for he acknowledgeth an everlasting counsel about them that Perish; yea, ( p. 76. ) that Christ in His infinite Justice permits such to resist grace; and had he understood himself, what could he say more, His saying that God considers them in his eternal counsel as having resisted all grace, & having hardened themselves finally, helps him not, for he must grant ( and does ) that if God had done as much for them, as He doth for his elect, it had been otherwise, but because He decreed not to do it, they naturally ly and dy in sin; and certainly He could not fore-see all this but in his own purpose.

And his Assertion is extreemly ridiculous, Viz. That Election and Reprobation are not contradictory, and that Election signifies a preference of some before others, it doth not argue a total reprobation of others. Certainly, if it be to glory that some are elected and others are not,

not, then they are reprobated i. e. God hath not seen meet to chuse them, which necessarily argues His purpose to leave them to perish in their sins, and what is this but Reprobation? He himself therefore grants, that in the end they shall be found Reprobates; and how is that, but by appearing not to have been chosen of God? Especially if it be well pondered, what he saith concerning God's Elect, p. 76.

There is a great fallacy lurks in his saying, (p. 76.) that as God hath provided grace whereby by some shall certainly be saved; so by the same all are put under a possibility; and that they are not, is not for want of Sufficiency or Efficacy in this grace of its own nature. We grant there is a sufficiency in the meanes that God affords to save all such as enjoy the Gospel, i. e. a sufficiency of means Isa. 5. 4. there need no more: nor doth He use more with them that are saved than with them that perish, 2. Cor. 2. 10. 16. But that He hath put a sufficient efficacy into these meanes in respect of all that enjoy them, is a paradox, whence is it then that they are not efficacious? The Efficacy is not in the meanes themselves, but in the Concomitancy of the Spirit with them to give it, and that is voluntary: and the very notion of a sufficient



sufficient Efficacy of meanes used, without the Effect wrought in them with whom they are used, is an unintelligible Quakerism.

In p. 77. he tells us that Election goes before Reprobation, and is not cotransious with it, and yet a little before ( pag. 75. ) he owns Reprobation ( though Conditionally ) to be eternal; and who taught him to make Periods in Eternity? Yea, Reason it self tells us that in the very nature of Choosing some before others, these others are in that very Act and instant, necessarily left out, which is Reprobation.

Sect. 6. Here he undertakes the Patronage of poor Infants, ( and it is pity but they who cannot speak for themselves should have somebody to speak for them ) whom he finds sadly exposed by this Doctrine of absolute Reprobation: and is in no little passion for them, to think that we should insinuate that some of these are by the decree left finally to perish: but though we may and ought to commiserate them, yet we cannot help them, beyond what God hath purposed concerning them.

His main Labour in this paragraph is to free Rom. 9. 11, 12, 13. from a true Interpretation, and force it to accept of a false one: and let us see what he hath to say against



gainst our glosses upon it.

He tells us that the Apostles design is to shew that God had chosen the line of Jacob before the line of Esau; and that only to be His Church in the peculiar dispensation of the Mosaiical law. That Paul is here treating of the Doctrine of Election and Reprobation; hath been fully evinced by many learned Orthodox. That he makes way to this by asserting the Sovereignty of God, is cleer in the Chapter. That his Instance of Jacob and Esau, did historically intend what G. K. alledgeth we deny not: But here it is to be noted, that there was a *Typical Representation* of greater things in these instances: & it is the Apostles manner to argue from the *Type* to the thing signified, see Gal. 4. 24. &c. but what further needs? G. K. ( p. 79. ) acknowledgeth that *this was a figure of another thing to be spiritually fulfilled*, and this is it that the Apostle useth it for; so that we may safely argue the thing *Typified* from the *Allegation*, it therefore hurts not our case, that he saith ( *ibid.* ) that *this doth not infer Esau's personal Reprobation as to his eternal state*; It is enough that there was a Reprobation in the same sense that there was an Election. If therefore he grants an eternal Election to be typified in it, ( as he seems to do ) the Reprobation must be

be of the same kind, else there is no parallel. It therefore concerns not us to dispute whether *Esau* himself were saved or not, though his Text cited, *Heb. 11. 20.* proves it not, for there were temporal, as well as Spiritual & eternal blessings: but this whole discourse is aliene, and makes nothing to the purpose. and whereas (p. 84.) he asserts that, the whole passage of *Jacob and Esau*, is a figure of two seeds, none of which were reprobated, but the other preferred is a contradiction, for there can be no Election without Reprobation, chusing it out of diverse, and necessarily argues a Leaving.

Secl. 6. p. 84. Here we are challenged to prove that there are *Reprobate Infants*, or such as go to hell for *Adam's sin* only: to which we reply. 1. He himself grants (p. 88.) that men generally (and why not universally?) are *Children of wrath by nature*: and he will not deny but that by *Nature* is intended that natural condition they were born into the world in (and then it must needs concern *Infants* as well as others) and this too is by *Adam's sin* transferred upon them, and his corrupt *Image* communicated to them. 2. That hence *Children* in their natural birth are under a sentence of *Condemnation to dye*, is a necessary *Consequence*. 3. That *God* hath nowher

revealed to us that He hath accepted of the Satisfaction of Christ for all that dy in their Infancy; and where there is no Revelation, there is no ground for Faith. 4. That there is merit enough for *Damnation* in them, else it would be unjust that they should be under *Condemnation*. 5. That this Sentence hath been actually executed upon some Infants, *Rom. 5. 14.* they never sinned actually, and yet they died, and it was the same death spoken of *vers. 12.* If therefore the Text which some of ours use, *1. Cor. 7. 14.* should not prove it, it follows not that no other can: and yet we suppose there is thus much in *that* too, *Viz.* that till Parents do openly profess the Gospel and submit to it, or as long as they abide in their Gentilism, their Children were also unclean, and so apparently lying under guilt, and lyable to eternal Death. And then he chargeth some of our Church Covenant, for glorying that none of their children were *Reprobates* while Infants; we declare it to be a slander: we never affixed Election to a *visible* Relation to the Church of Christ.

And how strangely doth he prevaricate, when he tells us (p. 89) That it is plainly revealed and declared in Scripture, that the condemnation is not simply because Adam had  
sinned

sinned, because of what Christ saith, *John 3*  
*19.* he might have read *vers. 18.* that *he that*  
*believeth not, is condemned already.* The Case  
 stands plainly thus; In the first Covenant  
 we stand condemned for the breach of the  
 Law, either as *Adam's sin* is ours by Impu-  
 tation, or as we have actually broken the  
 Law. Where the Gospel comes, Christ is  
 offered, a way is discovered to life by Him:  
 Now this is the proper Gospel Condemnation,  
 that men despise Him and will not follow  
 this Light; and this is added to the former,  
 they were before condemned by the Law, and  
 now the Gospel condemns them too.

What he saith, (*p. 86.*) That *All have*  
*an Opportunity or Possibility to be converted and*  
*become the Children of God,* is ambiguous; if  
 the word Possibility be *exegetical* of the for-  
 mer, viz. Opportunity, it is Nonsense, for  
 these two are Dispartes, if he intends them  
*disjunctively*, we deny not a possibility, for  
 all Mankind are salvable; but for an Op-  
 portunity we renounce that, for where the  
 meanes of Salvation are not, there is no op-  
 portunity. But what is all this to the pur-  
 pose? or what doth it make against the Re-  
 probation of Infants? We must be led a  
 wild-goose chase if we follow him in all his  
 absurd Digressions.

As for the Contempt which in the same page he casts upon *Federal Holiness*, it argues his ignorance; and as little as he counts the Interest of Children in the visible Covenant worth, we shall not cease to bless God that ours stand so related: and when he grants an *Holiness*, i. e. a capacity of holiness, in time to come, in some (not all) of our children, we believe if we had talked so wildly, nonsensically, and Self-contradictorily, we should have heard of him. To call a Possibility of Holiness, *Holiness*, is scarce sense, and to acknowledge a capacity of Holiness but in some, and yet but one page before, to plead a possibility of Conversion in all, would have been a Contradicting himself, if it had not been G. K.

Seet. 7. We have G. K. here speaking the Scripture fair. *The Scripture is a rich treasure*, and he is for *Scripture Words*, and it is not safe to leave them: and what is all this for? why, the Scripture indeed acknowledgeth all to be born in sin; but what then? Why, the seed or principle of sin and Corruption is, but it is not imputed, till men join their Consent to it, and actually obey it; and its as clear as midnight from Rom. 5. 13. and thus he interprets it; "The time of Infancy is the time wherein there is no Law, and therefore

“( tho children are dead in law ) there is no  
 “ imputation. Excellently well expounded!  
 Paul is there proving that there was a law  
 antecedent to the edition of the law of *Moses*  
 and his argument is because there was sin in  
 the world before: and that it is imputed he  
 might have found, if he had read the follow-  
 ing verse, for there we find the sentence ex-  
 ecuted, which necessarily presupposeth impu-  
 tation; nay, the very calling it *Sin* is a  
 charge or imputation, and a supposition of a  
 Law condemning men for it: nor do his ma-  
 ny Citations at all prove that none dye and fi-  
 nally perish for the first sin, but for actual sins of  
 their own; which was now to be proved; for  
 they only intimate that all mens actions are  
 liable to the Judgement, and shall be tried  
 and sentenced; but deny not that man's  
 state in *Adam* shall be so too: Because the  
 Scripture saith, that men shall perish for ac-  
 tual sin, doth it thence follow that men shall  
 not so for original sin?

But the knaek is, they died in *Adam*, and  
 Christ by His death for all that died in *Adam*  
 hath discharged all of that Imputation; which is  
 a perfectly *Arminian* principle, and hath bin  
 enough confuted by all that have written a-  
 gainst them: That therefore he concludes  
 that none do suffer final Destruction but for Re-  
 jecting



rejecting the Physician, makes the condition of Pagans better than that of Christians: for these are certain to escape destruction; being incapable of rejecting the Physician who is never offered to them, whereas Millions of those do reject Him, and perish for it. The Gospel then opens a door to man's Undoing, which else he had been out of the danger of, if Christ had but died for us and never told us of it.

His wild Assertion ( p. 91. ) *That all the children of Adam and Noah, have a federal Holiness, i. e. a seed of holiness in them, i. e. a capacity of being made holy* ( not to call the Coherence of it in question ) seems to contradict the Apostle, who, 1. Cor, 7. 14. assures us that Unbelievers children are *unclean*, i. e. not holy; and he there treats directly about federal holiness.

He concludes this Paragraph and Chapter with two Innuagations ( how true, let any judge ) 1. That *Grace is propagated by our natural parents.* ( how this is, it may be he will tell us next time. ) 2. That *there is habitual Sanctification in all men by nature.* As to the first, David was of another mind, Psal. 51. 5. For the latter, Paul was not acquainted with this principle, Rom. 7. 18. But he speaks as yet but in the clouds, we shall have



him a little more open in the next Chapter.

*Reflections on Cap. 6. of Christ's dying for all, &c.*

In this Chapter he proceeds more particularly to urge and maintain the Doctrine of *Universal Redemption*, and we might dismiss him for his Answer to the writings of the *Anti-Remonstrants*, but because many may not be advantaged with those discourses, we shall make a few brief Remarks upon his Absurdities.

*Sect. 1.* His first and main plea is from the words of Scripture, which express it in Universal terms, viz, *All, all men, every man, the world, the whole world*: (as for that of the *Body*, Eph. 5. 23. Paul himself there interprets it of the Church, and its strange that the World and the Church should be of equal extent) some of ours (whom he calls the *Adversaries of Truth*) have answered, (though it is not our whole Answer) that by *All*, is not meant all particulars, (i. e. *Individuals*) but some of all sorts, all the *Elect*. His Reply is, that the word [All] must needs be as full and universal with respect to Christ's death and the benefit of it, as it is with respect to Adam's Fall: and who denies it? But it is not so in his sense, except he will plead

for universal *Salvation*, as well as *Redemption*, else the benefit is not parallel to the damage; and so he indeed seems to plead, by Citing 1. Tim. 4. 10. for the proof of his Assertion; but yet this he afterwards denies. We are here to consider, that *Adam & Christ* are in Scripture made parallel in many Respects: as *Adam* is a common Head, so is *Christ*: hence, as *Adam* hath a natural seed, so hath *Christ* a spiritual seed: as *Adam* ruined all his seed, so *Christ* Redeemed all *Hu-*  
*as Adam's seed are called the world, because they comprize all the men and women coming into the world by natural Generation; so Christ's Seed are called the world, because they comprize all the men and women that belong to the world to come. But then we must remember, that Christ's Seed are a number selected out of the other; and therefore, though they are all because He loseth none of His Elect, yet not all the Individuals of Adam's posterity; for there are they of whom Christ saith, They are none of my sheep. Nor doth he interpret but pervers that in,*  
 2. Cor. 5. 14. *If one died for all, then were all dead: for the Apostles intention there, is to prove that all God's Elect were dead, because Christ died for them all: The word [All] therefore, doth not signifie*

some, but all that come under that denomination.

*Sec. 2.* Whereas Christ, *Job. 17. 9.* makes a Difference between His Redeemed and the world, and saith, *I pray not for the world,* he would perswade us, that world is there meant of final Impenitents, or such as have finally rejected the means of Grace; and with whom the Spirit hath ceased to strive. But not to call over what hath been already offered. Viz. That all have not the means of Grace, and therefore cannot resist them; it is plain that he excludes only the damned from Christ's prayer: and hence he infers that Christ died only for their sins past. Well then, He died for those sins, and prayed for those men: he then owns His death and prayer to be lost, and His Redemption void. Did Christ dye to condemn men, or to save 'em? see *Job. 3. 17.* why then are they not saved for whom He came to dye? Was He not able to draw them to Him, or to save them that come, to the uttermost?

That he saith, *Many are guilty of final Impenitency a considerable time before they dy;* seems to be a Contradiction, though he saith it is none. We believe indeed that many are left of God to persist in impenitency till

ill they dye; but then they are none of those for whom Christ died, *Joh. 6. 37.*

But we have him acknowledging; ( *pag. 96.* ) That *He dyed not for all, with equal intention or degree of Love*, and thereupon confessing, that *they that are saved have more abundant cause to bless God for His abundant mercy than the other*; though they have no reason to complain. We grant, the damned have no cause to complain, because they suffer justly: but we would fain know where he placeth the inequality, since ( at the bottom of the same page ) he tells us, That *God giveth no greater measure of inward grace to one than to another.* Oh! but he suits *Providences eminently*: And is this all the difference? We thought there had been different dispensations of grace clearly intimated in *Rom. 11. 7.* and one would surmise that what *G. K.* saith ( *ibid.* ) that *God drawes, moves, enclines, perswades* ( and that is more than meer swasion ) *them to come, and when they fall infallibly reclaims them, &c.* had been grace, and more than meer Suiting of Providences; especially, when he there also tells us, That *He and not they made them to differ from others*: and here against Scripture doth he bring that to prove his Assertion *1. Tim. 1. 14, -- 16.* *And the grace of our*

Lord was exceeding abundant with faith & love. We thought heretofore that Faith and Love had been graces: and that God's giving one more abundant grace than another, proves that one hath no more grace given him than another, is not very clear to us as yet. Nay, (p. 93.) he tells us, That God by His infallible persuasions of love and grace, prevails infallibly with the Elect; and is not the Effect of grace grace, yea more grace than where there is no such Effect?

That it is every mans Duty to improve all the meanes of salvation, notwithstanding he is not sure of his Election, is true, but that he can use grace to that end, before he hath any, is hard to understand; he should first seek for grace, for that universal grace he speaks of is a meer Non-entity. Nor doth our Doctrine of Reprobation (as he chargeth it, pag. 99.) make the effectual use of meanes absolutely impossible to any, so as to leave them under discouragement: for he himself tells us, that it is the Duty of all men to use the means, and yet he saith, that there are elect, and that none but these shall be saved: and we say the others are the Reprobate: and if all are to use meanes, and are not discharged, though but some (viz. the Elect) shall obtain, what discouragement is their more in our Tenet than in his?

*Seet. 3.* He well knew that Universal Redemption, without sufficient help, would render his Doctrine ridiculous; here therefore he tells us, how a sufficiency of means is afforded to all men; and First, That *Christ by His Death procured for all men an inward principle of divine grace, light, life, &c.* the Contrary to which is true; He purchased these only for his *Elect*, for whose sakes He died. The Scripture makes a difference between his being *head of the Church*, Eph. 5. 23. and his being *head over all things to the Church*, Cap. 1. 22. But supposing a purchase, what benefit can they have by it if it be not applied? Well, he will give an account of that too, as good as he can, (p. 100) *Where outward means fail, God supplies this with inward teachings, and some other secret ways of Providence:* and are these sufficient to lead men to Salvation, or bring men to Christ? The Apostle then must use a fallacious *Entymeme*, Rom. 10. 14, 15. And how perversely doth he interpret Christ to be the word spoken of, Rom. 10. 8. which is evident by the Context to mean the *Scriptures*? called the *Word of Faith*, because it is an instrument of begitting it, *vers. 17.* he interprets it of *Christ coming in the flesh, both of Jews and Gentiles*; and is that all the *Incarnation*

nation which he allows to Christ? He seems to be of another mind; (pag. 59.) but indeed we know not when they own any thing. And it was once the received Doctrine of the Quakers, That there is no other Incarnation of Christ, but only as He dwells in us; which how subversive it is to our hopes of Salvation, let the serious judge.

He mistakes the meaning of the word *Reprobates*, 2. Cor. 13. 5. endeavouring to prove that Christ is in all but *Reprobates*, and they are such as are given up to final impenitency; whereas the word there used, intends not *Reprobation* in our sense, but only that all *Unbelievers*, are at present unapproved by God, and in a state of Perdition.

Sect. 4. A further proof of this universal grace, is, that Christ both commanded that His Gospel be preached to all nations; and he tells us that so it shall before the end of the world; this is no proof of what it is brought for; the many generations past have no advantage by that, being ended and gone before that time comes: that therefore all mankind shall be accountable for not obeying it, because once in the end of the world it shall be reveal'd to them that are then living, is a slender way of reasoning; but his *Salvo* is, that though not outwardly at the present; yet inwardly to be  
sure



sure it is preached to all : but how this is, he hath not satisfied us in the premises, what he may do in the sequel we must wait for.

SECT. 5. This Paragraph is but *Nausea bis costis*, asserting, but neither expounding nor proving, that *all men have had more or less, and all sufficient means of salvation* : sure it will be some great thing, which has so much preparation made to introduce it.

SECT. 6. Here he begins with a good Confession, viz. that, Never any were saved but by *Jesus of Nazareth* ; but he seldome spake Truth without a design, and hath frequently some Error in a readiness to graft upon it. He knowes it would be asked him, how any could be saved by Christ, who never heard of him ? and how shall they hear without the Gospel ? He therefore anticipates it, and answers with Railing instead of Reason : only he puts in a Quibble, and thinks he hath tied a knot upon us that is indissoluble : We plead for the Salvation of *Infants* by Christ ; and why may not he with as good reason, plead for that of the *Gentiles* ? The paralel looks but odd, viz. If *Infants* may be saved by the working of the Spirit in them, why may not the *Gentiles* be so by giving obedience to the light in them ? We might only say, they are not causes equally powerful

powerful. But let us a little commoritate here? Observe then : 1. That we deny not the power of God to save without outward meanes ; but to argue meerly from His power to His Will, without His own Revelation, is to give laws to the Almighty. 2. That the Infants of Believers are under the visible meanes of Grace, viz. the *Covenant*, & *Baptisme*, and so are not the Heathen ; *Isa.* 63. 19. 3. That Christ hath assured us that some Infants are saved, *Mat.* 19. 14. 2. *Sam.* 12. 23. but we have no assurance concerning Heathen or Pagans, but the contrary, *Prov.* 29. 18. 4. That the different capacity of Infants and grown persons, in regard to the means, requires a different manner of the dispensation of grace to the one and the other : that therefore is asserted concerning all adult persons, *Rom.* 10. 14. For him therefore to assert that *All honest elect gentiles are saved in some other way*, is a meer Begging of principles that will never be conceded. That moral Honesty is a meritorious Cause either of Salvation, or of any further Discoveries of saving grace to men, is a Jesuitical principle ; That there are any Elect among Pagans, who never had the gospel offered them is not only without Scripture-Warrant, but

against

against its Testimony, as hath been agen and agen made evident. And his pleading for New Revelation of things not contained in Scripture, because Infants are saved by another manner of Application to them than *Adult* persons, is meerly precarious; for it is the same grace which is revealed in Scripture, which is reveled to them, if G. K. has said true, viz. That, None are saved but by *Jesus of Nazareth*.

SECT. 7. How perversly doth he here state the Question! viz. *Whether any are or can be saved without the express knowledge of Christ crucified, is one question, and whether without all hearing of Christ outwardly preached, is another.* We believe that God did not reveal Christ so clearly at first, as afterwards; nor had they, all of them in former times, the same distinct Conceptions about Christ, which are now made clear in the Gospel: but we also believe, that they had so much knowledge of a Saviour, as led them to place their trust in Him for Salvation; and these Truths were extraordinarily revealed to some; and gradually too: But that *All honest Gentiles who did by nature the things contained in the law, had an express knowledge & faith of Christ crucified* (as he asserts) is not credible to us; and when he bids us to disprove it, he for-

24 Of Christ's dying for all, &c.

gets all laws of disputation; for *Affirmanti est probare*; it sufficeth for us to deny it, & say there is no Scripture to prove it, till he produce it: the Spirit's working. When & Where He will, is no evidence for it.

A gross Errour it is in him to say (p. 110.) That the knowledge & faith of Christ belongs to the finishing work of Salvation, but not universally to the beginnings of it: for how shall they beleeve &c. Rom. 10. 14, 15. his instances in Nathaniel & Cornelius give him no relief, & its his ignorance (if not his maliciousness) to say that they were Unbelievers when that testimony was given of them, Job. 1. 47. Act. 1. 2. They had believed in a Christ to come, tho' at present they knew not that He was come in the flesh, till it was further revealed to them: And it would do well to observe concerning the latter, that though he had an Angel sent to him to direct him how he might be acquainted with that necessary Truth, yet Peter must come and preach it to him: and whereas he saith (p. 112.) that he had not faith in a crucified & raised Christ, but in God, and in the Word of God in his heart; We answer, that Faith in the word of God in the heart, without Christ, is not Saving, Act. 4. 12. Nor is Faith in God without Christ so, Job. 14. 6. And he is greatly mistaken, when he saith,

Of Christ dying for all. &c.

99

The mystery of Christ crucified was not firstly necessary to be known, as not being fully preached. It was preached from the Beginning, Gen. 3. 15. tho' more clearly in Gospel-times. All the Rites and Ceremonies of Moses's Law preached Christ; though the Veil is now taken off, and the glory of the Truth is more manifest and resplendent: he therefore concludes before he has prov'd his Assertion, That the express knowledge of Christ crucified, is not of absolute necessity, especially (he is very cautious) where it hath not been preach'd, to the beginning of a man's salvation, though indispensibly necessary to the finishing of it: And surely, 1. Cor. 4. 3. & Heb. 12. 2. stand much against him: And his so often iterated Assertion, That there are honest Gentiles still, that have not Christ outwardly preach'd, and yet dy in Salvation, is nothing else but a magisterial Assertion, without any one proof at all to command our Beleeef. What then shall we say to his new Doctrine (pag. 115.) That they may receive it after Death? [If he thinks to Father such a thing upon the Assembly of Divines, Cap. 32. S. 1. Confess. it's a bold *untruth*, for they say no such thing there, but beleeve that in the instant of dying, Believers are made perfect in holiness, *The Shorter Catechism, Quest. 37.*] we shall have

have a new Quakers purgatory erected ere long ; Christ revealed to men for Salvation after death, who died ignorant of Him ! And now what Reason hath he to conclude this Section with a Triumph ! That he hath demonstrated from Scripture, that men have been in a state of salvation, that have not had the Mystery of Christ made known to them ! unless perverting of the Scripture may pass for Demonstration.

*Sect. 8.* But what needs more than ? would he out-do Demonstration ? Fain would he draw in Paul, 1. Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6. to speak of the different degrees and modes of God's revealing Himself before Christ, under the Law, and after Him under the Gospel. Though we are satisfied that Paul aims at another thing, *Viz.* the distribution of gifts in the dayes of the Gospel variously : yet, supposing the other, what is *this* to mens knowing of Christ where the Law was not : or to the Gentiles being illuminated with saving knowledge ? and where does he find three Baptisms in Scripture, especially, such as that the First only reveals the Father, the second, the Father and the Son, the third, the Three Persons ? or had he this mystery by Revelation ? if so, he might have kept it to himself, for he hath discharged us from believing him : and wherein

OF THE LIGHT

wherein it is said to his disciples, and so on  
except it be to prove that man might without  
the light be saved without Christ, and thus  
will contradict his own promise.

Q. Now at length, after a deal of  
humour, waiting, we are come to the thing  
which he hath all this while been making  
way for, and this will take all the Prema-  
ture, remove all doubts! *The Light within*  
the Quakers God, and Christ, and Holy  
Ghost, and Word, and what not?

What particular thing this *Light* is, they  
seem to be in the dark about; very likely  
its beams are so languid, that they are not  
Self-evidencing. However, *something* it is,  
and it is so all men, year, so great a thing,  
that it may be *disaffirmed*; for he tells us,  
*It is no less than real Blasphemy* (though we  
think him, that he that hath made it blas-  
phemy, hath made it pardonable too) so say  
that the Devil in man is not sufficient to give him  
that knowledge of God that is necessary to Sal-  
vation. But how can we plead *Guilty* or not  
*Guilty*, till we know what it is that we have  
offered such an affront to? Let us therefore  
see if we may not find it out by some means,  
and whether he hath not help us in the search.  
He tells us, the *Assembly* shall call it the *light*  
of *truth*, & the Expression he can allow, but



not in our sense: Thus far we suppose he will grant it in our sense; viz. That the *Light within*, is that Discovery of divine Truths, which is made to men inwardly, as they came into the world, whereby they are able to know something of God, without outward meanes to acquaint them; or something within them, which doth make these discoveries in them: and this is not any special, extraordinary Indulgence to some, but it is common to *all* men, belonging to *Humanity*. Only herein we differ, and are not to be reconciled: We say, That it is nothing but some remaines of the Law of nature in the Hearts of men, *Rom. 2. 14.* which they are capable by their Reasoning Faculty of improving for the making a Discovery of many Truths by, which will suffice to leave men without excuse, *Rom. 1. 20.* [He mistakes when he thinks we reckon it any *distinct faculty*, the Understanding indeed, and in that the Conscience, is the subject of it, but it is something there imprinted.] He on the other hand tells us that *It is Christ Himself in the man*, and that *it is he who quickens and sanctifies nature in all men*; and this he understands to be the *Emphatos Logos*, in *1. 1.* which he falsly renders *Innate word*: it properly signifies, *Ingraffed*, as our trans-

flation renders it; and is a Metaphor from a *Siene* that is grafted into another stock than at first it grew upon; intimating that the word (whatever it be) is not natural to us, but is ingrafted in us supernaturally, and therefore is not put into the nature of all men, and that this word is not Christ, appears from *vers. 22.* and those that follow: it is a word that we are to be the *Learners and Doers* of, it is a *Law of Liberty* that we are to be *looking into*, which cannot be applied to Christ: no, not by any tolerable *Catacrefsis*.

There are Three things, which we will here not only assert, but also give Scripture proof for. 1. That Christ is not the Light of nature in all men. Is it the light in men that was born of a Virgin, hanged on a tree, buried in a grave, all which he else-where confesseth of Christ? Besides the Apostle expressly saith, that men in their natural estate are *without Christ*, Eph. 2. 12. and that *Except men be in the faith, Christ is not in them*, 2. Cor. 13. 5. and he tells us that *All have not faith*, 2. Thes. 3. 2. 2. That the Light of Nature left in fallen man, is not sufficient to point him out the way to Happiness; had not they the Light of Nature of whom it is said, Deut. 29. 4. that the Lord

has not given them eyes to see to that day? & they to whom Christ gave that warning, *Luc. 11. 35*? Doth not the Apostle describe the natural estate by this, *Eph. 5. 8.* and what saies he, *1. Cor. 2. 14.*? but we have him confessing this amply in *p. 120.* That man in his state of integrity had Light sufficient to have guided him to felicity, we believe; but all the Light of nature in fallen man, will not *objectively* reveal the truths necessary to be known in order to salvation. It had never told men of Christ, and the Satisfaction that is made to the Law by his Righteousness.

3. That God hath not any way imparted such a light universally to all men; which the fore-cited Scriptures do prove. Besides if this Light be connate with men, what needed *G. K.* to make such a splutter about *Immediate Revelations*? and if it be only by Revelations, where will he find evidence that God hath so reveal'd Himself to all?

*Seet. 10.* That from the *Law written in mens hearts*, he goes about to prove that man has such a *sufficient light*, is weak, for the Apostle speaks plain, in *Rom. 2. 14.* (which we are turned to) of the law given to man at the first, which is become weak through the flesh, and cannot give life; *Rom. 8. 3. Gal. 3. 21.* And his pleading from our Con-

cession, That it is sufficient to make them inexcusable, that it is therefore sufficient to make them excusable that frame their lives to it, follows not. The fall of man hath left him without strength to obey it. Rom. 5. 6. The Light of Nature discovers to man that Duty which he doth not, and, by reason of Sin, cannot do; which leaves him inexcusable, Rom. 1. 18, 19, 20. but it is Christ only that can take off guilt, and remove Condemnation; and the light of nature neither discovers His person, nor the way how to get pardon by Him.

His arguing ( pag. 121. ) That *Because for mens not glorifying God, He gave them up to a reprobate mind, therefore they were not Reprobates from the beginning,* hath no force of a reason in it; for, besides that (if we should take the word *Reprobate* in Rom. 1. 28. in such a sense ) a man may be reprobated before he be left up to make the open discoveries of it: the meaning of that place is, that God left them to a mind that chose dross rather than Silver, preferred wickedness before Holiness, and so was a mind disapproved of God.

And when He tells us that *The light the Gentiles had is a new gift and grace of God to them,* he saith nothing at all till he can

prove that there is such a gift common to all men; nor do all his alledged Scriptures speak one word that way: inward convictions and warnings of wrath to come (which we deny not to have been in heathen) will not amount to it, being only the Actings of a natural Conscience under legal Convictions, which indeed shew to man some of his Misery, but nothing of his Remedy: and that place on which he puts a peculiar Remark, *Luc. 12. 20.* God said, thou fool, &c. is as little to his purpose as any; for, if we cannot tell how God said so to him, yet it is enough that He did it by awakening of his Conscience, nay, that he did it Providentially; and what's this to a sufficient Light, telling men how they may be saved; it is a meer Wheedling and not Arguing.

It is therefore impudence in him to assert (pag. 122.) That though Gods Dispensations of grace be various, and the Gospel Dispensations (fine words!) be best; yet whoever is faithful in any one of these is accepted of God; and yet none is accepted but in Christ, or for His sake; and give no other proof for it, but his ipse dixit, which is of no value among sober men: and hence to conclude, That the inward Dispensation that is among the Gentiles that have not Christ outwardly preached, hath

hath its glory, and great service to those that are faithful in it, is to talk at liberty himself, and deny to all others a liberty to judge.

*Reflections on Chapt. 7. of Justification.*

The Doctrine of Justification is one principal pillar of our Faith, we cannot forego one clause of it without greatest hazzard: let him not then think to wheedle us out of it, his attempts so to do must be detected & defeated.

*Sect. 1.* When he saith, *God doth not justify men in their Ungodliness,* but from it, would be true, if he had not perverted it afterwards. To justify a man is to uphold and defend him in such a way, and to say to the wicked, *thou art righteous*; this is far from God. But to justify a man from his ungodliness, may admit of a double Interpretation, if it intend that He absolves a man from his ungodliness by a gracious act of pardon & acquittance, it is true: but if it intend a taking away of his sin from him by cleansing him from his filthiness, and purging the corruption of it out of him, (as he after interprets himself) this is no Justification at all, but belongs to Sanctification.

*Sect. 2.* He saith, *They are only the sanctified that are justified*; if he intends that



whom God doth justify, He doth also sanctify, it is a great truth; but if he puts *Sanctification* (which is a Concomitant) to be a cause of Justification, yea, the material cause, (as his following Discourse evidently insinuates) it is a deceit: and here he mistaketh when he saith, That *we are the seed of Christ by Sanctification*: which is only a benefit which Christ bestowes on His seed, and not a cause of their being so. And when he tells us, That *Christ bestowes Adoption only on His brethren*, it is as much as if he had said that Christ only Adopts the *Adopted*.

*Sett. 3.* Here he falls into down-right Popery, confounding those two great benefits of *Justification* and *Sanctification*, which (tho' inseparable) are to be distinguished. All Protestant Writers of Controversies against papists, have abundantly Confuted this mistake, only he will force us in the Sequel to make some brief Remarks on this matter.

*Sett. 4.* One Error begets another: a false principle will afford mistakes for Deductions; and here we see it: he took *Justification* and *Sanctification* for one thing, and so he tells us, that *God justifies not only by faith in Christ, but by a real inward righteousness too*: though Paul thought that these two ways of having a justifying Righteousness were inconsistent.



consistent. *Rom. 11. 6.* but herein he follows his Fathers the Papists; and whereas he saies That *The graces of Sanctification are the instruments of obtaining Justification from Christ*; he mistakes the order of *Christ's Benefits*; for its certain that there is none of these graces in the man habitually, much less the Exercise of them, before *Justification*: for, in & with the souls applying it self to *Christ* by Faith, it is justified; and it is to be remembered that *Paul* tells us, it is the justification of the ungodly, *Rom. 4. 5.* Such God finds them in themselves, when He comes to justify them. And when he saith, *Jesus Christ cannot be applied to men for justification, unless the man be made righteous*; its either a Contradiction or a Sophism. If they be made righteous for their justification, the Application of *Christ* for their Righteousness is superfluous: If he intends, that the Application of Justification makes them righteous, it is fallacious: it makes them so in a *Law* sense, but not in a *moral* sense, not justification, but *Sanctification* doeth that: his Similitude is from that which hath no likeness; his Scripture Citations are not to the purpose, that in *1. Job. 3. 7.* speaks of sanctification; that in *Rev. 22. 15.* speaks of the visible Right to Church-Communion, which

which men are to prove by their Obedience or if he will not admit of that, let him Remember that *Faith*, which layes hold on the Righteousness of Christ, is the great Gospel Command, 1. *Joh.* 3. 23.

*Sect.* 5. 'Tis a great mistake in him to say, that *Faith* is one hand to receive Christ, & *Love* is another; the Office of Love is another and quite different thing: by faith we receive Christ, by Love we serve him, or testify our Thankfulness in our Obedience to Him, *Joh.* 14. 15. and it is by Faith that we derive from Christ all that virtue which nourisheth the graces of Love, whereby we may serve Him, *Gal.* 5.6. And whereas he here applies the putting on of Christ to Justification, we that esteem Justification and Sanctification two things, reckon it to Sanctification, and that according to Scripture: for what else is the *Righteousness* and true *Holiness* by which it is interpreted, *Eph.* 4. 22. 23, 24.

*Sect.* 6. In this Paragraph he gives up the whole Cause, if he speaks sincerely; if not let him answer it to his Judge.

*Sect.* 7. That because *Pardon of Sin* is part of Justification: therefore *Repentance* a necessary instrument to obtain it, has no Consequence in it. *Repentance* being an im-

parabl

separable Concomitant of Faith, and influenced by it, Act. 5. 31. 11. 18. & elsewhere. Only let it be observed that we separate not Repentance from Justification, but deny it to have any causal Influence into it. His proof from Tit. 3: 5. is impertinent; we never denied *Sanctification* to be necessary to Salvation. But we suppose there is more requisite to *Salvation* than there is to *Justification*; not only must we be adjudged to the Inheritance, but we must be *made meet* or *suitable* for that happy state, Col. 1. 12. and that is by *Sanctification*, Hebr. 12. 14. this therefore is one of the Gospel Conditions of *Salvation*, but not of *Justification*. When he saith that *Paul* in saying that men are not justified by the works of the Law, only excludes the legal performances in which the Jews rested, who had not faith in Christ, he labours of a double mistake; for, both, all the Jews did not rest in them, but some had faith in Christ, and yet they did these works, and were not justified by them; and *Paul* renounceth his own works both before & after believing, distinctly, Phil. 3. 7. 8.

Seet. 8. Whereas he saith, that when *Paul* speaks of Justification by faith, he useth the word faith by a *Synecdoche*; it is *gratis dictum*, we have only his word for it, and how much

much the word of one guilty of so much Heresy and Blasphemy is worth on this account, let any judge. We grant that the word *Faith* is sometimes used for the Gospel-Doctrine, but when the Scripture mentions it as the instrument of justification, it is never so intended, and it belongs to him to prove it if he can.

Sect. 9. We understand not the meaning of his Rant in this Section about a *Christ divided*; a *Christ without* and a *Christ within*, a *Christ in heaven* and a *Christ in the heart*; we believe that there is but *One Christ*, and that He is in Heaven as to His *humane nature*, infinite as to His *Divine Nature*, and that by His *Virtue, Influence, and Grace*, He dwells in the hearts of all His people, and that they live upon Him by *Faith*.

Sect. 10. None of us ever doubted that *Faith hath true Assurance in it, and infallible* too: he therefore abuseth us in saying that we deny that *faith hath assurance in the being* of the nature of it: only he must give us leave (or we will take it) to distinguish between the *Assurance of the Object*, & of the *Subject*, by the *Assurance of the Object*, we understand the full *Secrity* which a believer is put into of enjoying eternal life, in the very instant of believing: this Assurance we say belongs

belongs to faith of *its own nature*, i. e. it cannot be without it. but the Assurance of the Subject is, that Knowledge or Discerning, whereby a Believer reads the Evidence, and has it infallibly confirmed to his knowledge; this we say is not of the nature of Faith, but belongs to inchoate Glorification; and that Believers may be safe, and yet want the Discerning of it, *Isa.* 50. 10. tho' we still believe (and have formerly proved) that this Assurance may be had without extraordinary Revelation: and he argues foolishly, that because *no place of Scripture tells us that we have these infallible marks, therefore we cannot know them infallibly without such Revelation*; for the marks are knowable, men have understandings and can know what they mean, & apply 'em; and the Spirit can and doth in this way set His seal to the Confirmation hereof,

*Seet.* 11. The poison contained in this Section, will be more fully discovered in the next Chapter, to which we refer the Reader to prevent the nauseous Tautologies which his book labours of.

*Reflections on Cap. 8. of Perseverance, &c.*

Its worth the observing, that all those that stand for Justification by *works*, deny the Doctrine of *Perseverance*; and great reason might be assigned for it. Wonder not then that we have

have him chopping at *this* Pillar too; but this Doctrine is a Cordial of such worth, that we believe that none who have received it in the promise, will readily part with it; let us then vindicate it from his false Comments.

*Sect. 1. Real and true beginnings of faith and Sanctification (saith he) may be fallen from: What meanes he by this? There are some previous and preparatory common works that are wrought in men; such as Conviction of sin and misery by the law, and the terrors of the Lord that make men affraid, and may put a stop to their lewd courses, yea, and work a reformation in many things, and make a natural Conscience to act more strongly than before: if he meanes these, we deny not but they may be lost; but then we deny them to be the beginnings of true justifying or saving faith, called the Faith of Gods elect, to distinguish it from other faith, and those which he instanceth in Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6 belong to this head; they had through these arrived to a Temporary Faith, but not to that which is saving; and therefore the Apostle charitably exempts his Hebrews from any such danger; as having other things in them, vers. 9. His instance from Rom. 11. relates only to a visible Church state, which*



all that stand in are not true Believers. That of the *Angels fall*, is impertinent, for they were under a Covenant of *Works*. Their Faith in the *thorny and stony ground* was but a temporary Faith, it had not a saving rooting, and for that Reason abode but a while. And we must distinguish between a false faith and one that is not saving: it is therefore blame-worthy for men to lose some things, the keeping whereof will not save them; such are all the moral principles which men have imbibed, such as the young man had, *Mat. 19*. And it is to be observed, that the good ground is differenced from the other three, by the epithete *good*, to shew that the other were not so in a spiritual sense; and though *God's children feel many thorns & stones in their hearts after Conversion*, yet their hearts being in saving measures softened and broke-up, they receive their Denomination from the better part, according to Scripture. Nor will the *Parable of the Virgins*, *Mat. 25*. begin. help him at all: we grant, the *oyl* there signifies *true saving grace*; but then by *Lamps* we are to understand an outward profession: by *Vessels*, the heart; the *foolish Virgins had oyl in their Lamps*; i. e. they pretended to, and made a profession and shew of Grace, though they had none really: the



*wise virgins* had it in their *lamps*, i. e. professi-  
on, and vessels too, i. e. hearts; and it is no  
new thing for the Scripture to express  
things which men seem to have, as if they  
had them, because they hold others in hand  
and often deceive themselves into a beliefe that  
they have them, see *Luc. 8. 18.* compare *Mat.*  
*13. 20.* His allegation from *Ezek. 18. 24.* &c.  
may at first seem to have a face of a plea in  
it, but it only seems so. Other Scriptures  
assure us that no true believer shall finally &  
totally fall away from grace; and Scripture  
doth not contradict it self. Several things  
might here be offered; briefly Consider,

1. This is but a conditional expression, and  
therefore asserts nothing to his purpose. 2.  
God is pleased sometimes, to curb in His  
people's Corruptions by such Conditional  
Threatnings, see *Rom. 8. 13.* *Heb. 12, 14.* for  
they have nothing in themselves, but what  
they might lose if God did not secure it; &  
God so preserves His People as to stir up fear  
and care in them. 3. And what if we say,  
That God speaks to them in respect of the  
typical part of the typical Covenant, to whom  
the promises and threatnings concerning the  
typical blessings of *Canaan* were made on these  
conditions, which they might either keep or  
break, and by breaking fall from them, and  
forfeit

forfeit their lives and Land.

That David is a clear instance of one that totally fell from grace, he proves not: the sins he committed were great, the Aggravations heinous, but if he had totally lost his grace, why doth he pray, *Psal. 51. 11. Take not thy holy Spirit from me!* Nor doth it follow (as he intimates,) that because a justified man may fall into Murder and Adultery, therefore the worst of men may believe that they are true & real Saints; for they never had the work of Conversion past upon them, as David had; and besides, such horrid falls break their bones, defile their hearts, wound their graces, and consequently becloud their Evidences, what plea is there for such as never had any Evidence? Nor doth it follow that if these men dy in their sins they shall go to heaven immediately: For tho' God suffer (for holy ends) His Children to fall far, yet as not to fall totally; so He will give them Repentance: tho' they just fall, yet he shall rise again: Nor will God suffer them to dy, before He hath recovered them. Neither yet doth our Doctrine encourage to any hope of such who so defile themselves, and dy without Repentance. It is therefore a vile Aspersi<sup>o</sup>n to call our Doctrine *Poisonous*. We believe that sin of its own nature kills the sinner, that its wages is death.

death; that the soul that sins shall die: but we believe that he may dy in his *sin*, that God can pardon and justify him for Christ's sake; and that if He doth, He will sanctifie him too; and what *poison* is there in all this? the foundation of a sinners hope is laid in this; and but for this hope, the least sin of thought is mortal; all the gall therefore that he vents in these three pages hurts us not, being meet false Aspersions, or deceitful insinuations; and doth not he himself say, *that if God suffers those whom he hath drawn, as any sinners depart, they shall certainly be reclaimed*, p. 46. *may, that they shall infallibly be called, & at last glorified*, p. 76. ) Nor could he have said, that this makes God a respecter of persons in the worst sense, if he had not been ignorant of what that Respect of persons is: there is no respect of persons in *gratitude*; for that is only when Justice is perverted; for some minister consideration: the owner may do with his own, what he will. Besides there is in the bestowing of the Recompence of glory, a vast difference between them that receive it and such as miss of it. *Isa. 25*, tho' still it's God that makes them to differ.

*Self. 2.* That God hath laid duty upon His people to use endeavours for their standing we deny not, but constantly urge; but the

always

alwaies where the promise of preserving 'em in faith is mentioned, *this condition is understood*; is warily to be taken up; if he intends that God will keep them, by fulfilling the Condition in them, it hurts us not; but if he mean, that the promise depends on our performing the condition, and so is merely *Hypothetical*, its an error; for it is certain that the very keeping of His people from utterly falling, belongs to the promise of the New Covenant, under which they are *By Believing*, Psal. 84. 11. Jer. 32. 40.

Sect. 3. G. K. knowing that there were some Scriptures that did so fully assert the *Perseverance of God's People*, that he could with no face deny the truth in them, begins, in this Paragraph, to concede, yet so as not to favour our principle at all, who say, that its the priviledge of every true Believer to *persevere*. He therefore makes it a particular *state of Holiness* which only some of these arrive unto; and then they *commit no grosse sins*, but only Peccadillo's (and thus, with the Papists he introduceth the distinction of *mortal and venial sins*, which hath been sufficiently confuted by ours; who have made it evident that *all sins are mortal by the law*, Ezek. 18. 4. That all sin, excepting that *against the Holy Ghost*, is venial by the Gos-

pel, *Mat. 12. 31.*) but when he comes to describe who these are that are thus indulged, he wofully provaricates. In p. 46. he tells us they are, 1. *such as are born of the free woman, and not of the bond woman*; Well, this is not a peculiar priviledge of some, but is common to all Believers, even the *Galatians*, who were so weak and foolish, *Cap. 4. ult.* 2. *They are thoroughly renewed.* If by being thoroughly renewed, he meanes so sanctified as to have no dreggs of sin remaining; then there are no such; for he grants of these he speaks of, that *they do commit little faults*, & that must be because there is something of the *old man* in them. If by thoroughly, he meanes in all the parts, then it belongs to every Believer, 2. *Cor. 5. 17.* 3. *They are such as are born of God*: and that belongs to Faith where ever it is, *Gal. 3. 26*, *Job. 1. 12.* When he saith that, *those who commit any gross sins, as Fornication, Murder. Adultery &c. never arrived to the pure state of sonship*, he doth, 1. Mistake the notion of the difference between servants and sons; true beleevers are both, sons by Adoption, servants by being devoted to the Obedience of the Gospel. How often doth Paul call himself the servant of Jesus Christ? and so does James, *Cap. 1. 1.* & Peter, 2. *Ep. 1. 1.* & Jude, vers. 1. Its true, Paul distinguish-

eth between the outward servile Condition of Beleevers under the Old Testament Dispensation, and the more free and son-like Condition of them under the New Testament, *Gal. 4. begin.* but he assures us that they were *children*, tho' but in their *Nonage*.  
 2. Contradict the Scripture; *David* fell into some of those sins, and the worst of them, and yet before that, he had the highest Testimony of his Sonship. *Solomon* had his amazing falls, and yet God witnessed before & after that he was His son, & that He lov'd him; called him *Jedediah*, *2. Sam. 12. 24, 25. 1. Chron. 22. 9, 10.* He seems in all this discourse to lay the stress upon the strength of Inherent Grace, and the Beleevers own Attainment, whereas the Scripture assures us that it is of God, and depends upon His power, *Rom. 5. 2. 14. 4. 1. Pet. 5. 12. 1. 5.* and God hereby perfects strength in weakness, *2. Cor. 12. 9.*

In p. 147. he strangely confounds the two Covenants; and yet really grants the whole Case: He saith, *The first Covenant may be fallen from; the Angels and Adam fell totally; but the new Covenant cannot be fallen from? & thus we say; but the knack we were not aware of is, a man may be a Believer, and yet not in Adam's covenant, than which there*



can be no greater Contradiction: or a man may be in a middle state between both; which is the greatest confusion; or finally, he will have none to be in the new Covenant till they come to Glory, and then they shall sin no more; and this is directly against Scripture.

Pag. 148. He saith, *There may be infallible marks and signs of such given, and yet God only knows them, and such to whom He reveals it.* We thought that Marks had been given purposely to know by, but the Folly of this hath been already detected.

Se<sup>ct</sup>. 4. We are now come to the Quakers Doctrine of *Perfection* of which they boast: and here he first rails at ours that denies it, and then tries to prove his own, tho' that very Essay will prove him to be very imperfect.

That the *best Duties* of the *best Saints* in this life are *imperfect*, and that by reason of sinful mixtures in them; and that daily the most holy come short of perfect legal Obedience, & might be charged with *sin* for their best, if God should be strict, we believe; & can appeal to the sensible complaints of holy men in Scripture; but for him hence to infer, that we say, that, *the good works of God's Holy Spirit are defiled in & by the saints*; and



to print it in another Character, as our very words, is cheating. But how far our Duties are the work of the Spirit, and how far they are our own, has been already discussed. Its he that makes the *Chimera*, and not we; we never say, that *One & the same thing is a perfect man & a perfect dog*: We say, that every Believer in this life, hath a new nature & an old in him; a body of *Grace*, & a body of *Corruption*: the one *increasing* & the other *decaying*; imperfect grace, but *growing*; a body of death, but *dying*; and he is as it were *two men*: and so *Paul* distinguisheth of himself, *Rom. 7. 15. 17.* Nor do we say that the work is *totally perfect*, and *totally sin*; but we say, that the work it *self* is *imperfect*, by reason that, though it be influenced by grace, it is also defiled by sin, being done by one in whom there is both sin, & the Influence of it into his best performances. Nor do we any whit *misinterpret God*, when we say, He accepts of these works in Christ, tho they be defiled: and if he shall say, that we do therefore suppose that God accepts of the defilement that is in them, he mistakes: In all the gracious *Actings* of Gods people there is Imperfection ( now all moral Imperfection is defilement ) and God accepts of the *sincerity*, & pardons the *imperfection*, and both in

Christ. And this indeed is the priviledge of the Covenant of *Grace*, above that of *works*; why else was the High Priest to make an Attonement for the Sanctuary, &c. Lev. 16. 33. but that the Services, notwithstanding the *pollutions* ( but for which no attonement was needed ) might be acceptable? and this was Typical. No doubt but that *God sees sin in whomsoever it is*, and where He sees it, He condemns it; but in respect of *Imputation* to the person, He does not alwaies see it, i. e. charge it. Num. 23. 21. and why? but because *CHRIST* hath made Satisfaction and Attonement for it.

In his Examen of the Scriptures alledged by the Assembly, he plays foul with them: he first points to three places, where he saies they speak of this matter: *Confess. cap. 16. sect. 5. Larger Catech. Q. 149. 89.* tho' this last is on another subject. Secondly, he gathers up *diverse* matters in one, endeavouring to express them in as harsh words & sense as he can. Thirdly in p. 155. 156. he gathers up the the whole, and saith, *they expressly so word it in Q. 39.* which is utterly false, & indeed, he hath so worded it for them, that there are two things Charged on them which they say not: viz. 1. That *that they must sin as long as they live*; as if there were a fatal necessity

necessity that God laid them under of so doing. 2. That they are only free from sinning after death; whereas they say *At* their death. 3. he mischievously perverts the design of the Scriptures alledged by them. All the Scriptures he animadverts upon, are only those which they annex to Q. 49. (omitting those added in the other places.) Let us observe, There were *two things* they had to prove, 1<sup>st</sup>. That no man can in himself perfectly keep the law, 2. Nor by the Grace of God; and from these principles they infer these Conclusions, That they daily break the Commands in thought, word and deed: and how pertinent these Scriptures are to prove these two positions may be judged. That Man cannot do it in himself, one wou'd think that the description given of his natural state, Rom. 3. 9. &c. & Gen. 6. 5. is sufficient to demonstrate. That (as to the latter) he cannot do it by Grace received, doth not intend that God cannot give them grace enough, but that He *doth* not, & therefore their imperfect grace cannot attain it. And surely that is sufficiently proved by such Scriptures as, 1. tell us, That *in many things* all do offend, for which, Jam. 3. 2. Ezek. 7. 20. 2. That every Believers grace depends for its exercise upon the help of Christ, without which they can do no gracious

ous thing, for which, *Joh. 13. 5.* And the Confectary is not forced, if we consider, that the Nature of man being so corrupt, unregenerate men can do no other than daily break the Command; that because Believers are renewed but in *part*, and yet are active beings in *thinking, speaking, doing*, there will be an Influence of remaining Corruption into these *actions*, which will make 'em short-coming in point of the strictness of the *Law*, and consequently breakers of it. In the other place cited, *Confess. cap. 16. sect. 5.* they quote, *Isa. 64. 6. Joh. 3. 17. Rom. 7. 15; 28.* and certainly *Paul* had as much grace as any now can Pretend to.

As to his particular Reflections on the fore-cited Texts, they are scarce worth minding. What he observes on *Jam. 3. 2.* is a mistake of what they brought it to prove, and it doth prove against him, the Imperfection of any in this life. For that in *Ezek. 7. 20.* his observation, that *the word is in the future*, makes against him, intimating that they can do no other as long as they live; and his putting it for the *potential*, is precarious, his applying it to *the times of the Law*, which made nothing perfect, is fond; for they had the Gospel as well as we, and were perfect in an Evangelical sense, *Gen. 6. 9. Joh. 1. 1. Psal.*

**Psal. 37. 37.** For that in **Gen. 6. 3.** when he saith it only speakes of that generation of men so degenerate. he errs; it shews the natural state of man by the Fall, and we have its Parallel after that generation was gone; **Gen. 8. 21.** Nor was *Noah*, so perfect, but that he was afterwards drunken. For that **Rom. 3. 9. &c.** we grant it *expresseth the natural state of men as they are* ( not only ) *generally*, ( but universally ) *under the Law*; & it was brought by the Assembly for that purpose: nor is it any Contradiction to say, *Righteous men sin*: we must distinguish between such as are righteous *legally*, and them that are so *evangelically*; and between such as are free from the *Dominion*, and them that are free from the *presence* of sin.

**Sect. 5.** When therefore he cites **Rom. 3. 18.** to prove that *Perfection*, because they are *free from sin*, it will not do; that is to be understood of freedom from the *dominion* of it, see **v. 14.** And his Application of **Ezek. 36. 25. & Jer. 33. 33.** is confused, for want of distinguishing of what it there referred to *Justification*, and what to *Sanctification*; That *Justification* is perfect we acknowledge, ( tho he before denied it. ) that *Sanctification* is imperfect, we plead ( tho he saith it is perfect ). Now the making them clean from all  
their

their filthiness, belongs to Justification: putting the Spirit in them: giving them an heart of flesh, &c. belongs to Sanctification, and this confirms them in perseverance; for they shall not depart, but doth not wholly deliver them from sin.

His plea for perfection from *Matth. 11. 29.* because Christ's yoke is easy, and from *1, Joh. 3.* the commands not being grievous, is too far fetch't; we are to distinguish between Legal and Evangelical Obedience: the Gospel hath abated of the Law, and provided strength for us to obey Evangelically, and made the command grateful to our new nature; and Christ's grace is sufficient for what he intends by it; but what is that to the Power of exact performing the law in its latitude?

And its his ignorance in the Gospel which transports him into the following blasphemy against God, calling Him *Cruel* and *Tyrannical*, and *worse than Pharaoh*; his friends the *Arminians* do the like: and why? because *He* requires of some, that which *He* gives them no ability to perform: Had man had none in *Adam* it would have look't harder; but since he *had*, and wickedly lost it, and cares not for having it agen; shall God now lose His Glory because man hath by his own fault



fault lost his power, or must He otherwise be said to be *cruel*? Certainly if we cannot see into the depth of His providence, an Holy God is not thus to be treated by a vile worm: Nor is it (as he pretends) *injurious to men* pressing after perfection, and his Similitudes to illustrate it by are fopperies, and no way quadrate. Death is but *Catacrestically* (or worse) said to *heal all bodily diseases*: but Grace is then properly perfected, and sin abolished; and that is a great comfort, that when we remove hence we shall sin no more. the City we are going to lies beyond Death and the Grave, & so it is no discouragement that we can't reach it in this world, *Heb. 13.*

14. Christ hath provided sufficiently to keep his people from sloth, & make them press to the mark. Who of us ever said that if a man dy in his sins, his faith shall save him, tho he live and dy in his sins? what's this but to slander? We say, that Believers shall not dy in their sins, but God will give them Repentance, if at any time they fall: and yet that they sin more or less till they dy, we say, GOD saith so too: but it's one thing to have Sin in us, another thing to be in our Sins: And when he saith ( *pag. 159.* ) That, *It is an ill sign that we plead so earnestly for sin*; We Demand, Is a saying



saying that we have sin in us, which calls for our humbling, and plying the work of mortification, and going daily to Christ the fountain, a pleading for sin? surely they that Cover, and not they that Confess their sins are pleaders for it: and then we are sure that sin never had such Attourneys as the Quakers.

Sect 6. Now for the positive proof of Perfection: and he is at a loss how to define it, or where to state it: he seems to deny absolute or perfect Perfection, & yet challengeth as much as Christ or Adam ever had. Nay, 2<sup>dly</sup>. He grants that *It is not in all, but in some*; and that *not at first conversion, but afterwards*. Nay, 3<sup>dly</sup>. He further conceives that *It is not in the most perfect without Infirmity* ( & that must be in a moral sense ) and then there must be some sin: and that is almost as much as we say. Yea, 4<sup>thly</sup>. he yeilds all that we pretend to, though he will not acknowledge it to be sin. *Viz. Motions to sin, not only from the devil without, but from the mortal part within*: and that is it which Paul often calls *sin* in Rom. 7. and whereas 5<sup>thly</sup>. he pleads that *it be, yet it is not imputed*; that is another question. It sufficeth that it is imputable, and it is on Christs account that it is not actually imputed. and 6<sup>thly</sup>. *The wind* by

the whole, he comes to a fair acknowledgment, that he pleads for no more perfection in saints than we do. *It is a Faithfulness to God, in that degree of Grace and assistance that He affords, according as he sees meet, some more, some less, I, but in them that have least, it is safe dying for them in that state: and all this we plead and preach for.* And now let any man judge how he hath gone thro', and cleared the charges that he made against us in his blasphemous letter. If to ly, slander, pervert Scripture, magisterially dictate Heresies, is to be acknowledged for conviction, we are gone to all intents and purposes.

*Reflections on Cap. 9th of the Visible Church.*  
We have already seen what little Reason there is to indulge the Doctrine of *Immediate Revelation*: Allow but a Quaker this *Engine*, and he will do wonders with it: beat down the foundations of many generations, un-Church all Christendom, make the Scripture to intend just contrary to what it speaks; & who shall question him, if he tells us he sees all this in the *Light*, & hath it immediately revealed? G. K. hath hitherto discharged this against the fundamental Articles of Salvation; endeavouring to set GOD against Himself, and sham us out of our faith: Nor hath he done yet, but will a fresh essay

to remove all that is visible of Christianity in the world, and if he can blow up Churches, take away Sacraments, and wrest out Sabbath out of our hands, what would Beelzebub himself have desired more? But the Church is built upon a Rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

*Sect. 1.* His first Essay is against the Church considered as visible: and here he cavils at the description of the visible Church given by the Assembly; *viz.* That it consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true Religion, together with their Children: insinuating that we hold that nothing of grace, or of the power of godliness is requisite to constitute a member of our visible Church: but this is all Railing, not understanding what we mean by *Visible*, nor what by *Profession*.

1. It is the visible Church they speak of, and he also after grants that there is such a thing: and what is it that makes it visible? it must be something that makes it discernible to others: Here then observe, 1. That there is inward Grace required absolutely to make any one a living member of Christ, & of the church of the first-born. 2. That this sincerity of heart is to give its evidence to others by an answerable life and conversation: There is a confession of the mouth, as well as a

*believing*

believing in the heart, *Rom. 10. 9.* 3. These Fruits are they by which others are to judge of mens Sincerity, and accordingly to declare them to be visible members of the Church: this rule the Apostles themselves followed in their owning of men. 4. That such a profession may be, where sincerity is *not*; and thus Hypocrites may belong to the visible Church; there were such in the primitive times, *Simon Magus, Demas, & those, 1. Joh. 2. 19.* were such. 5. There may be many Irregularities in the Conversation of such, which yet do not presently unchurch them; such there were in the Churches of *Corinth & Galatia.* 6. That when such are become scandalous, there are Church-censures appointed by Christ; and these can be administred to none but under the consideration of their being Members of the Church visible: thus *Paul delivered Hymeneus &c. to satan.*

2. Profession, as it is understood by the Assembly, is not a meer *verbal* thing, but *practical* too: it contains in it an Orthodoxy in the principles professed, and a Conversation framed thereto, a *professing in words, & a not-denying in works,* else men are not visible Christians, but to be *turned from.* 2. Tim. 3. 5. and yet we believe that men may do all this, and be close Hypocrites; and that they

may afterwards fall away, G. K. himself confesseth : and now let us trace him .

He infers, that *Notoriously-scandalous persons, liars, deceivers, drunkards, &c. are qualified members of our Church*; but without reason; if he should essay, he would find it to reject him for some of the qualifications he mentions : We acknowledge not such for professors; and if any in our Churches afterward prove so, we censure them.

And it is grossly untrue, that *Independents require no more than such a profession as he talks of, to make them members of their church* : for they whom he calls *Independents*, distinguish between the Church visible, or Christianity at large, & Membership, or Fellowship in a congregational Church, and have not been wont to be charged for their *Laxness*, but rather for *Strictness* in Admission. Nor doth it argue them of Hypocrisy, or contradiction, because they separated from another Church, viz. the *Episcopal*, it being well known that they did it mainly because their terms of Communion were such as they could not in Conscience comply with; tho' also their promiscuous Admission of all sorts of ignorant & scandalous persons to the *Lords Table*, added to the incitement : as for the *Presbyterians* in Churches, we did not separate from them

but have held Communion with them, and have admitted their members to Communion with us ; although by reason of some points of Church Administration, which they differ from them in, in *principle*, they thought they might without any just offence do so in *practice* too.

Sect. 2. How daringly doth he here assert, that we find no such Church in all the Scripture, owned to be the church of Christ, that the outward form or profession of religion makes such ; for when the whole New Testament acquaints us with no other, if he keep to his subject, viz, *a visible Church* ? For indeed it is nothing else but such a profession as we have described, that can make them so ; nothing else can give them the visibility of a Church ; and how strangely do's he talk, when he saies, *We nowhere find in scripture any society called viz the church of Christ, that had nothing but the profession of the true religion ?* who ever said that they had nothing but so ? We say, if the profession be right, its a making sincerity visible as far as may be : but yet let us tell him, there are such owned for Churches, indeed which the major part were such as he mentions, *Sardis* was so, *had a name to live, & was dead*, had but a few names, *Rev. 3. 2.* and *Lacedaemon* was so, *vers. 15.* But the truth is, he



equivocates about the word [ *True* ]: If by a true Church he intends such as are united to Christ in truth & sincerity, we plead it not: but the word also signifies that there is really such a thing; and that there is really such a thing, is visible: there may be a true visible Church, tho many in it are not of the true invisible Church.

Scct. 3. Men that talk of two things, may thwart one another strangely, but we thought he had been discoursing of the *visible* Church: and if so, then he is deceived when he saith, *that every member of Christ is a living member*: Christ hath said otherwise, see *Joh. 15. 2.* & vi. how in Christ but by profession? their being fruitless proves them dead: and they might be taken away, which they could not be if they were not first in him: and he did well to instance in the Church of Corinth, *1. Cor. 3. 6.* there was the *old Leaven* in this Church which was to be *purged out*; there were fearful *divisions*, there were that would *eat in the Idols Temples*, that horridly profaned the *Lord's Table*, that denied the resurrection of the body, &c. Such a mixture there was in this Church, & yet see what a glorious *Epiconium* Paul gives them, on the account of their being a visible Church. *cap. 1. begin.*

His finding fault with us for using an Hour-

glass



*glass*, to know how the time spends, and a *Bell* to gather our Assemblies together orderly, is worse than ridiculous: That God's people should have their Meetings to worship GOD, is undeniable, to neglect it is a sin, *Heb. 10. 25.* as for his inward spiritual Bell ( which he calls the Gospel-bell, ringing in their hearts ) serving for such a use, it may is a Fancy more fabulous than any thing in *Aesop*: as if the Light-within were a Clock to tell the hour of the day. Besides, it is certain that God's people in all ages have had a known time of meeting, and some civil sign to give notice, that they might meet together, as in one place, so at one Time: and he knows that we place no holiness in Bells: yea, the very Scripture which he abuses, to prove a *Gospel bell*, is directly against him, *Psal. 89. 15.* which intends the *Silver Trumpets* which God appointed for such an end, as ancient & modern interpreters agree: yea the Quakers themselves give notice of their meetings.

*SECT. 4.* He makes *The work of conversion wrought by the Spirit in the hearts of God's Elect*, to be the true gathering of a visible Church ( for of that he must speak or he is distracted ) and let any man of sense judge, whether this be any gathering of a visible Church at

all; or whether this makes a man so much as a visible Christian; it being a thing secret, and that which no man knows but he in whom it is wrought. As for his Banter here about *new-made things*, it is but a second Disgorging of the vomit, which he hath licked up after he had once before spewed it, in p. 36. where he is animadverted upon, & once is too much.

*Sect. 5.* Here he agen confounds the mystical invisible Church, which the visible, and gives the encomiums proper to the one, unadvisedly to the other: which mistake led him to draw that blasphemous Inference (p. 172.) that *the Religion which we profess is not the Religion of Jesus Christ, and that in the foundation it self which is Jesus Christ*: hence we do (without any breach of charity) infer that G. K. bids the world to take notice that he utterly renounceth the religion we profess, even in the very foundation of it, which is JESUS CHRIST, and of which he himself (if we are not misinform'd) once made no mean profession in the University of Aberdeen; and say if *Julian the Apostate* did worse!

*Sect. 6.* He contradicts himself here in the same Paragraph; at the beginning he saith, that Christ is but one both in heaven. and in us; and

much and before the end he tells us, that by the Spirit the man is joined both to Christ in him, & to Christ in Heaven: and if two Unions, then two Christs.

*Sect. 7* Now he afresh sets upon us for our Qualifications required in our Ministry; but it hath been already canvass'd in *cap. 4.* Only towards the latter end of this Section, he tells us of *Two spirits that guid men on earth, the Spirit of God, and of the devil, &c* he gives three Criteria of men's being guided by the latter; *Viz. he is fallible, false, & continually given to Errors*, by which he clearly detects himself to be under the devil's leading; for he hath before acknowledged himself to be fallible; and we have proved him to be false, and continually leading into Error.

*Sect. 8.* The fault which (in this paragraph) he finds with our Ministry is, that *they are not itinerary, as the Apostles, whose Successors they pretend themselves to be;* [truly better sit still in a place; than go up & down, seeking whom to devour] But may we not succeed the Apostles in their Ministry, tho' not in their Apostleship: And do we not find, that though they went about to gather Churches, where there was none, yet when they had gathered them, they ordained Elders

ders among them to be settled Ministers, such as were *Overseers* of particular Churches, see *Act.* 14. 23. 20. 27. with 28.

The Scandal he reflects upon us, in respect of the *Endeavours for the Conversion of the Indians*, is sufficiently confuted by the printed accounts that are published to the world of this affair; and what if they be not all sincere? it's God's work, and not in our power to make any so: We say of our selves as *Paul*, 1. Cor. 3. 5. 6.

Sect. 9. It seems strange to us, that something invisible should make a Church *visible*, as having alwaies thought, that a thing was *visible* when it might be *seen*. The *Inward Light* in a man then cannot be the *visibilty* of a Church to men. But we find no end of such foolish Contradictions.

*Reflections on chapt. 10. of the Sacraments &c.*

The last Mine he has to spring is to demolish our Sacraments and Sabbaths,

Sect. 1. That the word [*Sacrament*] is not to be found in the New Testament, we grant: but it hath obtained to be a Word used in the Church, for many ages to express that by, which is evidently enough laid down in Scripture, nor doth he dispute us about the Lawfulness of using such words.

But

But when he saith, *there is no word in Scripture to answer that word, except the word [Mystery,]* we cannot go along with him; that the word [*Mystery*] is at all used in this sense, we suppose cannot be proved; but there are two other that are; and imply as much as we intend by a Sacrament, viz. a *Sign* and a *Seal*, which are both used of the Sacrament of *Circumcision*, Rom. 4. 11. and by parity of Reason are applicable to the New-Testament-Sacraments: that *Baptism* is such a sign: is evident from, 1. *Pet.* 3. 21. that the *Lord's Supper* is so too, *1. Cor.* 11. 26. for how is the Lord's death shewed forth in it, but by an instituted sign? And when the Church of *Rome* can shew as good a plea for their other five, as we can for these two, we will then confess the injury we have done in denying them.

¶ Sect. 2. Now for *Baptism*! What need he to combat *Infant-Baptism*? If there be no *Baptism*, then none of *Infants*: only he loves to be wrangling. and what Cavil against *Sprinkling*, if neither *that* nor *Dipping* be of force by *Divine Institution*? Thus some must be meddling.

As for *Sprinkling*, we plead not for it; we say *Baptism* is a Gospel-Ordinance; that *Water* is the Element to be applied, that it may

may be done either by Dipping *into*, or *Pour-  
ing on* of water, there being no expresse Pre-  
cept for the one more than the other; that,  
it being a *sign*, it hath no other *Efficacy* than  
by the Blessing upon the Institution, that as  
a sign. it may signifie, by pouring upon one  
part of the Body; that the *Face* is most  
ready and convenient, and why may we not  
allude to that of Christ to *Peter*, Joh. 13. 10.  
that we do it on the *Forehead* particularly, is  
a slander. When he asks us, *Why John bap-  
tized Christ by Dipping Him in Water?* We  
think his first Question should have been,  
*Whether he did so or no?* and it is certain  
he cannot prove that he did. Our *Conse-  
quence from infant Circumcision to infant Bap-  
tism* is good: for, it was the same Cove-  
nant, and the same promises that *Abraham*  
and we had, *Circumcision was a sign of the Righ-  
teousness of Faith*; and so is Baptism; and  
*Infants* are as capable of the one as of the o-  
ther: and the promise is still to our Chil-  
dren.

That the *Baptizing of Infants* was not the  
*practice of the Church during the first century*,  
is arrogantly affirmed by him, against Anti-  
quity: *Origen* and *Cyprian* tell us that the  
*Apostles gave order for the Baptizing of Infants*;  
and *Augustin* tells us, *Baptism of Infants had  
been*

*been universally practised in the Church ever since the Apostles.*

And sure he mistakes when he saith that in *Col. 2. 11, 12. Neither circumcision nor Baptism there mentioned is outward*; Whereas the Apostle is arguing from the sign, to the thing signified by it, in respect of Circumcision; & then mentions Baptism it self intimating that it signified the same thing, & therefore laid them under the same obligation to Holiness: there is therefore a *sacramental* Dying with Christ; because in this Ordinance there is an engagement laid upon us to dye to the world. And what a poor shift is he put upon, when to evade *Mat. 28. 19.* he acknowledges the *Institution of Baptism*, but tells us *it saith nothing of water*? doth not the very Word imply it, and the Gospel assure us that *Water* was the Element? Furthermore, We have two Baptisms mentioned, *Mat. 3. 11.* it must then be *one* of these two, but the Disciples could not baptise with the latter, it being Christ's alone prerogative. In citing of *Luk. 18. 15, 16.* he fraudulently omits that clause, *for of such is the Kingdom of God*: and G. K. assures us that *that Kingdom is on earth, as well as in Heaven*; and if so, then they are Subjects of the priviledges of this Kingdom, as far as capable:



capable: and of the same import is that, *Rom. 11. 16.* for all his cavil against it? nor doth it follow that *they may receive the Lords Supper as well*; because that is above their Capacity at present: a Child may be an Heir, and yet not be put into actual possession of all that he hath a right to: and though *Christ Himself baptized not*, yet His *Disciples* did by His Authority.

SECT. 3. That Baptism with water properly belonged to John's Ministry, is easier said than prov'd: that *It is expressly contra-distinguish'd from Christ's baptism, by John and Christ Himself*; is an error; the outward Administration is distinguished from the Efficacy, which depends upon Christ, and not on the Minister: but not *contra-distinguished*, for these are two, but not *contraries*, but *concomitants*, as being indeed, two parts of the same Sacrament. And that it belonged not limitatively to John's Dispensation appears, because Christ gave order for the Continuance of it, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* Philip baptized the Eunuch with water, *Act. 8.* Paul baptized, *1. Cor. 1. 15.* Nor will he ever disprove the *Baptizing with water*, being appointed, *Mat. 28. 19.* till he can prove that there is some other ministerial Baptism, for which he must run to his Revelations, Ten thousand

thousand of which are worth nothing. And what an infatuation is it to tell us, *there are no other words of institution*, but the words of Institution? What more would he have? Nor doth he evade by telling us, *they could baptize with the Spirit as well as beget sons and daughters to God*; for this was done ministerially by dispensing the Ordinances, which Christ only can bleis to that end, though He own His servants as workers-together with him in their place; but they ever renounced their doing any of these things *by their own virtue*. Yea, also *Baptism* is signified in *Mat. 28. 19.* to be one way in which they made disciples of them: But he fore-saw that we would tell him, that the disciples under Christ's Dispensation, and after the Resurrection of Christ, baptized with *water*; & has provided a fine Evasion, viz. *It was done by Toleration, as many things else by the Law*; but we suppose that Infant-Baptism was not of the Law, but of the preparation of the Gospel: yea, an Institution which Christ Himself confirmed by his commands, and so, not a meer Toleration. And when *Paul* saith, *he was sent to baptize*, it is meant not so much to baptize as to *preach*; he was an Apostle & had diverse Ministers waiting upon him, who were ordinarily imployed in baptizing

tizing such as by his Ministry were prepared for it : his Thanking of God therefore that he baptized so few, was not because the Ordinance it self was not Authentick, and honourable. but because as there was no necessity ordinarily for him to do it *personally*, so it eventually prevented occasion of their *naming* themselves from *Paul* : this Reason he gives 1. Cor. 1. 14. if *G. K.*'s pretended reason had any weight, he had broken his Commission in baptizing of any.

Somebody owes him thanks for his Charity, that allows *Babes and children their Images*, &c. *provided they are cordially zealous for spiritual Baptism* ; and he grants *there are some few such* ( only *Christ* is little beholden to him for making a sacred Institution of His a *George-on-horseback* to invite children to their books ) but for us, we are not thus obliged, for we are not so much as babes, but *meer Hypocrites, and Formalists* : did he ever read, 1. Cor. 4. 8. and Rom. 14. 10. we have alwaies professed our zeal for the inward Baptism, & our whole Ministry is a witness to it, only we are for both Baptism with water and the Holy Ghost, and the Quakers pretend to be only for the latter ; and which is most agreeable to the mind of *Christ*, let the Scripture determine : and indeed they  
thus

thus take away the very means appointed by Christ for enjoying that other.

Sect. 4. Nor doth he treat the sacred Supper with any better language. He grants *That Christ had an outward supper of the Pascal Lamb*: i. e. that He had the sign without the thing Signified; i. e. that Christ ate the passover hypocritically, which is prodigious Blasphemy. When he saith, *Our sacrament hath no inward spiritual signification to us*, he arrogates God's Prerogative, who only can judge the heart immediately: and his reason is groundless, for we never denied a *real and spiritual partaking in Christ*, though we allow it not in the Quakers carnal sense, but spiritually.

When he takes notice of *Christ's drinking first, and drinking twise at the Sacrament*; he bewrayes his ignorance or perverseness; if that place be more obscure, it is to be interpreted by such as are more clear: the other Evangelists mention the order of the Institution; By Christ's first blessing and giving the Bread, and after that the Cup; and *Paul* tells us he received the Order from Christ Himself thus, *1. Cor. 11. 23. &c.* Christ indeed kept two Sacraments at one Meeting, the *Passover* which He now antiquated, and the *Supper* which he now instituted; the former

Cup belonged to the Passover, which also represented Christ, and Jewish Antiquity tell us, it was their custom to conclude that Sacrament with such a Cup.

In pag. 188. we have him there introducing a new Sacrament, which he tells us they have at their *ordinary Meals*, and the *Ministers do consecrate them, sometimes by Praying, sometimes by silence*, ( a new way of Consecration ) and to this he shrinks up this Gospel Ordinance; which is pure *Familism*, endeavouring to banish all instituted Worship out of the Church, under a pretence of continual holiness, a fine way to extirpate Religion out of the world, by Evacuating the Appointments of Jesus Christ. We believe that there is a spiritual Feeding on Christ, which believers are to practise daily by the exercise of Faith; and are Satisfied that our *Eating &c.* should be always *to the glory of God*, and might possibly say as much of that *as*, and with more truth *than* he. But Christs institution is something beyond that, and is appointed as a special help of our Faith in these exercises, here in therefore *they are behind us*, they pretend to no more than we do, and in our measure endeavour, whereas we are also for the Sacred Institutions of Christ, to help us in all other duties; and we think that our Sup-

per is beyond theirs, as being an holy Ordinance of Gospel Worship, and theirs is only the Common duty of all men : we believe that outward eating is but a sign of the inward, and therefore not to be rested in, but because it is a sign: and Christ hath enjoined the use of it, we dare not omit it.

That all outward Eating and Drinking is a natural and necessary sign of the Inward, we utterly deny ; that it is accommodable to it by way of resemblance, we acknowledge, else Christ would not have chosen it for this end: but we use them for figures upon the account of His institution, and not because of a natural Analogy ; else we might multiply Sacraments at pleasure; and yet we grant it to be as much a natural sign, as the outward world is a figure of the inward, which he saith Paul expressly calls it. 1. Cor. 7. 31. when there is not one syllable expressly or consequentially intimating any such thing.

Seet. 5. But if the Sabbath may but be cashier'd, the other Ordinances will fall. Here then, his first cavil is against the first day of the week, but if he decries any outward Sabbath at all ( as he calls it ) the First day needs no more Vindication than any other : touching the Change of the Sabbath, such as acknowledge the Sabbath to be moral & perpetual



tual by divine precept, may find it made good by many, Sheppard, Owen and others. His Cavil also against Rev. 1. 10. hath been fully answered by the fore-cited Authours, and he seems himself to grant the cause, for he tells us (p. 193.) *It is commendable in Christians to set apart the first day of the week for rest from Employments and to help the mind in its spiritual exercises*: now, they must set this day apart rather than any other, either because the day it self hath some Betterness in it, or because Christ hath put an Excellency upon it; the former cannot be proved, the latter can be only by His sanctifying of it, to be a Day of Rest.

Nor is the Changing of the Seventh Day which was the Jewish Sabbath, into the First which was the Christian-, to put the first day of the week in the Room of Christ; for not to say, that it is hard to prove that the Seventh Day was meerly a Jewish Type of Christ for it was appointed before there was any Revelation of Christ, or occasion for Him (viz. in Innocency;) but if it were, yet the Sabbath it self was not so, but a time appointed by Divine positive precept for the performing of natural and instituted Duties to God in, and is therefore of a natural and perpetual consideration, & cannot cease to

necess



necessary, till such duties cease, or men can do them without taking time to do them in.

And is he not run quite out of breath, when he tells us that, *Exod. 20. 8, 9* saith nothing of one day in seven, but only of a seventh day, we thought that had been one day of seven: but suppose him to mean, that it is not arbitrary, but fixed it; we may in part grant it, viz. that it fixed it to the Seventh day, which God saw meet to appoint, but that it necessitated it to the last of the seven, so that God could not alter it to the first of the seven, there is no need to conclude, and the Scripture will prove the contrary, because He did afterwards change it.

And whereas he so often pleads that, *The Sabbath is Christ and nothing else*, he poorly proves it from. *Heb. 4. 9. 10.* it is there said that *Christ entred into His rest*, and doth that mean, that he entred into Himself? his Asserting that in the *New-Testament* there is no outward day is nonsense; what inward day did he ever hear of? He thinks the words outward and inward, may be applied to every thing, but he must run up the folly a little further; we cannot prove (saith he) that the fourth Command enjoined the Jews to keep an outward seventh day: we know that it was a Seventh day, it is expressly so

said, and if he can find out an inward one, it will be a rare invention: we are sure that it was a day to be celebrated from the Evening to the Evening. Nor is his allusion to the tenth Command of any strength; that that *only enjoins inward duty & not outward*, is a grand mistake: every Command of the Decalogue respects the actions as well as the heart, and so do the fourth & tenth.

*Reflections on his Call.*

He hath now done with his Doctrinal part, and shuts up all with a thing which he styles, *A Call & a warning to the people of Boston in New-England to Repent, &c.* in which, by his *language* he arrogates to himself as much as any of the Prophets of old had of an *immediate* Mission from God. We shall not trouble our selves with the reviling Language he here useth, ( *Jesus Christ will call him to account for that ere long* ) but only endeavour to make it evident by his own manner of expressing himself, that he is no true Prophet.

1. The true prophets do not use to ly, especially in delivering their Messages; and that he doth egregiously, there hath been more than once observed in his book; and what doth he less when he here tells us that *God hath enlightened us all to turn from darkness to light &c.*?

2. Pro-

2. True prophets do not use to Slander, and how often he hath done so by us, we have seen throughout the pamphlet, & here also, p. 200. in saying, that *We profess to own Christ without, but do not own him within*, an horrid abuse!

3. Prophets are not wont to rail and revile, and that *he* doth; as if he had been educated to it, particularly p. 198. and all this he chargeth upon strangers, whom he had no knowledge of.

4. Prophets use not to deliver false Doctrine & Heresy, & such is his whole Pamphlet stuff'd withal, in particular, that of the *Light-within*, which he here chargeth us for *Blaspheming*, p. 198.

5. Prophets use not to speak Nonsense, and that *he* is notoriously guilty of, and a Specimen of it he gives in the warning it self, which he tells us he had in the *Light*, p. 201. where he chargeth us for *calling our duties*, & tells us not *what* we call them; though possibly he could not tell, for we call them, *dirt*, & *dung*, & *nothing*..

6. Prophets don't use to call men to repent of their holding *the Truth as it is in JESUS*, and his Call is nothing else.

7. Prophets are wont to shew some *Proof* of their Call, but he hath shown none; he tells

said, and if he can find out an inward one, it will be a rare invention : we are sure that it was a day to be celebrated from the Evening to the Evening. Nor is his allusion to the tenth Command of any strength ; that that *only enjoins inward duty & not outward*, is a grand mistake : every Command of the Decalogue respects the actions as well as the heart, and so do the fourth & tenth.

*Reflections on his Call.*

He hath now done with his Doctrinal part, and shuts up all with a thing which he styles, *A Call & a warning to the people of Boston in New-England to Repent, &c.* in which, by his *language* he *arrogates* to himself as much as any of the Prophets of old had of an *immediate* Mission from God. We shall not trouble our selves with the reviling Language he here useth, ( *Jesus Christ will call him to account for that ere long* ) but only endeavour to make it evident by his own manner of expressing himself, that he is no true Prophet.

1. The true prophets do not use to ly, especially in delivering their Messages ; and that he doth egregiously, there hath been more than once observed in his book ; and what doth he less when he here tells us that *God hath enlightened us all to turn from darkness to light &c. ?*

2. True prophets do not use to Slander, and how often he hath done so by us, we have seen throughout the pamphlet, & here also, p. 200. in saying, that *We profess to own Christ without, but do not own him within*, an horrid abuse!

3. Prophets are not wont to rail and revile, and that *he* doth; as if he had been educated to it, particularly p. 198. and all this he chargeth upon strangers, whom he had no knowledge of.

4. Prophets use not to deliver false Doctrine & Heresy, & such is his whole Pamphlet stuff'd withal, in particular, that of the *Light-within*, which he here chargeth us for *Blaspheming*, p. 198.

5. Prophets use not to speak Nonsense, and that *he* is notoriously guilty of, and a Specimen of it he gives in the warning it self, which he tells us he had in the *Light*, p. 201. where he chargeth us for *calling our duties*, & tells us not *what* we call them; though possibly he could not tell, for we call them, *dirt*, & *dung*, & *nothing*..

6. Prophets don't use to call men to repent of their holding *the Truth as it is in JESUS*, and his Call is nothing else.

7. Prophets are wont to shew some *Proof* of their Call, but he hath shown none; he tells

tells us indeed that it is by *Immediate Revelation*, but withal hath told us, that if it cannot be proved by Scripture, we are not bound to believe him: and so we dismiss him, only wishing him at leisure to read, Jer. 23. 31, 32. Ezek. 13. 6. --- 10.

*An Appendix.*

**W**E had now done with him, but that he hath printed at the End of his *Call the Copies of three Letters*, two of his and one of ours, nor needs much to be said to these.

As to his first Letter, all the Reflexion we shall here make is, that he tells us in it, that *the false Doctrines which he chargeth upon us*, were such as he was assured by the Spirit of God that we taught them, and that they were false: Now the Spirit of God assures none of a Ly, and that in matter of Fact. But we have before intimated, that the 12th. Article in his Charge, is none of ours, but the contrary; by which it appears that G. K's Spirit teacheth him to ly.

What we have to say in Justification of our Answer to him, will be seen in our Animadversions on his reply.

For he tells us, *We called his letter a blasphemous & heretical paper, and give no satisfactory reason*



reason for so doing; We had then no opportunity, but we hope we have now done it to the Satisfaction of the sober.

2. That *When our carnal weapons were gone, we found no spiritual ones*: We suppose it is now evident that he was mistaken, if the Word of God be the *sword of the Spirit*, as it is called; Eph. 6. 17.

3. He vaunts that *We have no courage to appear in the open field, but lurk in our dens where the honest Quakers have no occasion to beare us*: but we say, it is their own fault; for our preaching is open, and our doors shut out none but those that will not come.

4. He calls us *Beasts of prey, and Night-birds, that creep out only in the dark*; but this charge is very impertinent and contradictory; it was in his Language night with us, when our Liberties were taken away, and then (if at all) we refused to come out, and then G. K. comes daringly; he then is the *Forrest-beast*, by his own doom.

5. He boasts of his great Conquest in his book, and yet (like an Hypocrite) would arrogate nothing to himself, no, he is but like the *Barly cake which tumbled into the host of the Midianites*, only his Conquest is not like to hold the parallel, for we suppose we have made



tells us indeed that it is by *Immediate Revelation*, but withal hath told us, that if it cannot be proved by Scripture, we are not bound to believe him: and so we dismiss him, only wishing him at leisure to read, Jer. 23. 31, 32. Ezek. 13. 6. --- 10.

*An Appendix.*

**W**E had now done with him, but that he hath printed at the End of his *Call the Copies of three Letters*, two of his and one of ours, nor needs much to be said to these.

As to his first Letter, all the Reflexion we shall here make is, that he tells us in it, that the *false Doctrines* which he chargeth upon us, were such as he was assured by the Spirit of God that we taught them, and that they were false: Now the Spirit of God assures none of a Ly, and that in matter of Fact. But we have before intimated, that the 12th. Article in his Charge, is none of ours, but the contrary; by which it appears that G. K's Spirit teacheth him to ly.

What we have to say in Justification of our Answer to him, will be seen in our Animadversions on his reply.

For he tells us, *We called his letter a blasphemous & heretical paper, and give no satisfactory reason*

*reason for so doing;* We had then no opportunity, but we hope we have now done it to the Satisfaction of the sober.

2. That *When our carnal weapons were gone, we found no spiritual ones:* We suppose it is now evident that he was mistaken, if the Word of God be the *sword of the Spirit*, as it is called, Eph. 6. 17.

3. He vaunts that *We have no courage to appear in the open field, but lurk in our dens where the honest Quakers have no occasion to heare us:* but we say, it is their own fault; for our preaching is open, and our doors shut out none but those that will not come.

4. He calls us *Beasts of prey, and Night-birds, that creep out only in the dark;* but this charge is very imperflnent and contradictory; it was in his Language night with us, when our Liberties were taken away, and then (if at all) we refused to come out, and then G. K. comes daringly; he then is the *Forrest-beast*, by his own doom.

5. He boasts of his great Conquest in his book, and yet (like an Hypocrite) would arrogate nothing to himself, no, he is but like the *Barly cake which tumbled into the boſt of the Midianites*, only his Conquest is not like to hold the parallel, for we suppose we have made

made his *Cake* appear to be *Dough*.

6. He thinks we were afraid of exposing our people, and wonders that we have wrought no more on them all this while: and might we not lawfully have a cautious Fear? Ought not the Shepherd to be aware when the *Wolf* comes to his flock? Nor did we ever pretend to make our people savingly holy, any further than as God blessed our endeavours.

7. He wonders we doubted his design; but we knew he was a Quaker.

8. He tells us that he came not of his own will, but by a necessity from the Lord: but gives no demonstration.

9. He Wrote this treatise of the will of the Lord: and little reason to boast of that: It was of God (doubtless) to leave him in the hands of satan to be thus acted: If we say we have written this *Answer* in the will of the Lord, we can give a better account of His approving will in it, because written in defence of the Truth of Christ which he has perverted, & the Name of Christ which he hath blasphemed, this moved us to reply upon him, and this is of God.

10. He desires us, If we answer him, not to defend our cause with Railing and Lies; Physician, heal thy self; he hath set us a precedent.

ent



and Hereticks, grown beyond Admonition; but persons that had been trained up in false principles, from whence they endeavoured to draw them, which alters the case: nor is it any *Contradiction*, that Quakers may be invited to come to our publick Meetings, and yet not admitted into our private Houses: There are the instituted meanes, which if they come to, they may possibly be convinced; but the Scripture has given cautions to Christians in the other respect. Nor is there any parallel between his comparison & the thing, *Turkish Pyrats hang out false colours and invite men to rob them*; that we do neither, He that will one day vindicate His own truth & ways, will make it appear, then *Wisdom shall be justified of all her children*; mean while we take it to be one Commendation of our Doctrine & Ministry, that G. K. and such as he rail at and revile it.

But before we part we shall, for the Satisfaction of some, who possibly are concerned that we took him not up, when he challenged us to a publick disputation, subjoin our reasons then moving & swaying of us; which were *not* from any suspicion of our own cause, which nor Fear of his strength of reason, or jealousy lest our Hearers should be seduced; but, would

1. it was not in our power to grant it so

him

him, without laying our selves obnoxious to the then Government, who had expressly forbidden the people to take liberty of any publique Meeting together on any occasion on the week-days, besides the usual Lectures.

2. We knew none of our Hearers that had any scruple on their minds about any of those Truths which he charged with falsehood, but believed them firmly, as far as we had any knowledge, and therefore to dispute them for their sakes, was altogether needless.

3. We knew ( partly because he was a Quaker, partly by the reports of his managing himself *elsewhere*, partly by his first Article of his Charges ) that there would be no holding of him to any Law or Rule of Disputation, but he would bring all to his Revelations, and therefore the whole must needs issue in a tumultuous Brangle.

4. Because he had declared himself at once in opposition to almost all the *Fundamental Articles of Religion*, which had been maintained for almost *seventeen hundred* years, by the Church of Christ ; and in Defense of which so many thousands had laid down their lives ; and who but Men Distracted, would expose these to be publickly debated, it is so many disputable Points in Religion upon

*Appendix.*

upon the Challenge of a *fearful Apostate*  
And we suppose here is enough to satisfy a-  
ny that are intelligent.

But now being under some Necessity, we  
have ( with no little Tediouſness, in being  
put upon it to take notice of so many Imper-  
tinencies, Fooleries, and Tautologies, as his  
Book is fraught with ) answered the Sub-  
ſtance of what he hath said, with as much  
Brevity as is consistent with Perspicuity.  
And so we commend it for its Success to His  
Grace and Blessing on whom alone it de-  
pends.

---

F I N I S.

---





are  
ishe a-

y, we  
being  
imper-  
as his  
e Sub-  
much  
quity -  
to His  
it do-